

Concordia Theological Monthly



DECEMBER

1951

Concordia Theological Monthly

Published by The Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod

EDITED BY THE FACULTY OF CONCORDIA SEMINARY
ST. LOUIS, MO.

*Address all communications to the Editorial Committee in care of
the Managing Editor, F.E. Mayer, 801 De Mun Ave., St. Louis 5, Mo.*

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

PAUL M. BRETSCHER, RICHARD R. CAEMMERER,
THEODORE HOYER, FREDERICK E. MAYER, LOUIS J. SIECK

CONTENTS

FOR DECEMBER 1951

PAGE

TRIBUTE TO DR. WILLIAM ARNDT	881
RESOLUTIONS OF APPRECIATION	882
GOD'S TRIUMPHANT CAPTIVE CHRIST'S AROMA FOR GOD. (2 Cor. 2: 12-17.) <i>Victor Bartling</i>	883
LUKE 17:20-21 IN RECENT INVESTIGATIONS. <i>Paul M. Bretscher</i>	895
THE APOSTOLIC PSHA! <i>Martin H. Franzmann</i>	908
GOD'S CONCURRENCE IN HUMAN ACTION. <i>John Theodore Mueller</i>	912
CHALCEDON AFTER FIFTEEN CENTURIES. <i>Jaroslav Pelikan</i>	926
JOHN CHRYSOSTOM ON THE CHRISTIAN HOME AS A TEACHER. <i>Arthur C. Repp</i>	937
LITURGICAL DEVELOPMENTS IN EUROPE. <i>Walter F. Buszin</i>	949
HOMILETICS	955

CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY is published monthly by Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis 18, Mo., to which all business correspondence is to be addressed.

\$3.00 per annum, anywhere in the world, payable in advance.

Entered at the Post Office at St. Louis, Mo., as second-class matter. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 5, 1918.

PRINTED IN U. S. A.

ynod

are of
5, Mo.

SIECK

PAGE

881

882

883

895

908

912

926

937

949

955

ishing
ndence

ce for
1917.
U. S. A.

C

v

T

V

in

in

fr

id

1

P

M

w

sa

is

S

te

N

w

o

le

o

H

th

a

c

Concordia Theological Monthly

VOL. XXII

DECEMBER 1951

No. 12

Tribute to Dr. William Arndt

WE dedicate this issue of the MONTHLY to Dr. William Arndt, honored teacher, beloved colleague, eminent scholar, and humble Christian. Dr. Arndt's name is inseparably linked with the history of this journal since its birth in 1930. From 1930 to 1938 he was one of its co-editors and from 1938 to 1949 its managing editor. But Dr. Arndt was also identified with former theological journals of our Church. From 1924 to 1926 he edited *Magazin fuer ev.-luth. Homiletik und Pastoraltheologie*, and from 1926 to 1930 the THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY. We thank Dr. Arndt for these services, faithfully and well performed.

The present issue of the MONTHLY is in the nature of a *Festschrift*. Except for the sermon study supplied by a pastor, the entire issue consists of theological studies contributed by members of the St. Louis Faculty. Since Dr. Arndt devoted the major part of his teaching career to the language, interpretation, and history of the New Testament, the *Festschrift* is featuring several articles dealing with New Testament subject matter. Nevertheless, the other theological disciplines are not neglected. Each is represented by at least one article.

In December the Christian Church commemorates the birthday of the Savior of the world. He employed Dr. Arndt as His δούλος. Him Dr. Arndt served as his Κύριος. Therefore, though we dedicate this *Festschrift* to Dr. Arndt, we are, in reality, laying a trophy at the feet of the incarnate Son of God, Jesus Christ. May He continue to bless our beloved colleague!

THE FACULTY OF CONCORDIA SEMINARY, ST. LOUIS, MO.,
THROUGH ITS EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

Resolutions of Appreciation

Whereas,

The Reverend Professor William F. Arndt, Ph. D., D.D., has been a member of the faculty of Concordia Seminary in St. Louis, Missouri, for a period of thirty years; and ~

Whereas, He had previously served as a pastor of The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod for nine years and as a professor at St. Paul's College, Concordia, Missouri, for nine years; and ~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Whereas, As a scholar, a theologian, and a teacher, he has been of singular benefit to the entire Church in the training of her ministry; and ~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Whereas, In the interest of the Church and in keeping with the precepts and teachings of the Word of God, he has helped to advance the cause of ecumenicity and of God-pleasing church union successfully and with due foresight, courage, patience, and discretion; and ~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Whereas, He has exerted a widespread and salutary influence as an author and editor; and ~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Whereas, In his labors as a colleague he has been consistently kind, considerate, understanding, and helpful, always bearing in mind his obligations as a servant of Jesus Christ and of the Church; therefore be it ~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Resolved, That the faculty, at this time of his retirement from our midst, express its appreciation for the valuable service he has rendered to Concordia Seminary and to the Church at large; and be it furthermore ~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Resolved, That the faculty assure him of its prayers for continued health, strength, joy, and blessing; and be it furthermore ~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions over the general signatures of the faculty be given Dr. William F. Arndt in testimony. ~ ~ ~ ~ ~

<u>Louis J. Schuch</u>	<u>Norman R. Perkins</u>
<u>John Stueben Mueller</u>	<u>Robert C. Rupp</u>
<u>Charles Hoyer</u>	<u>Marion H. Friesmann</u>
<u>A. M. Reinhardt</u>	<u>Amelia B. B.</u>
<u>St. Meyer</u>	<u>Orin E. B.</u>
<u>George B. Schuch</u>	<u>Walter E. B.</u>
<u>Robert H. Schuch</u>	<u>Frank C. B.</u>
<u>Paul K. B.</u>	<u>August von B.</u>
<u>Alma B.</u>	<u>Walter B.</u>
<u>Joseph B.</u>	<u>John B.</u>

God's Triumphant Captive Christ's Aroma for God

(2 Cor. 2:12-17)

By VICTOR BARTLING

THE teacher to whom we offer this *eucharisterion* has lived and labored among us as "God's triumphant captive" and "Christ's aroma for God." In discussing the Scripture passage giving us this view of the ministerial office we hope to do so in a bit of the practical manner which has always characterized the Scripture interpretation of our colleague.

Before we take up the passage, it will be useful for us to look at the wider as well as the narrower context.

Second Corinthians presents many baffling puzzles to the critic and interpreter. A satisfactory reconstruction of the historical background is exceedingly difficult, if not impossible. There are, also, many allusions in the letter to circumstances of which we are ignorant and about which Paul, perhaps with feelings of delicacy, writes with intentional vagueness. Furthermore, the unrestrained outpouring of strong and mingled emotions from beginning to end demands a special effort of sympathetic penetration on the part of the reader. Finally, there are numerous linguistic difficulties. The Greek is at times hard to construe, owing to the ruggedness of style which results from dictating when the feelings are deeply stirred. In some cases, too, the precise meaning of individual words and phrases must at the present stage of Biblical philology remain uncertain.

But in spite of these difficulties the letter intrigues every reader. Here the fascinating, forceful, complex personality of Paul confronts us more than in any other letter. Here he reveals his own soul. We see his motives, his joys, his anguish, his hopes, his fears, his wounded feelings, his ardent love. The secret of this unique personality, his one impelling purpose, patent in every paragraph, becomes vocal in his mighty utterance: "If we are beside ourselves, it is *for God*; if we are in our right mind, it is *for you*. For the love of Christ controls us, because we are convinced that One has died

for all; therefore all have died. And He died for all, that those who live might live no longer for themselves, but for Him who for their sake (better: "for them," A. V.) died and was raised." (2 Cor. 5:13-15. R. S. V.)

Especially the pastor and theologian will do well frequently to read the letter, if not in Greek, then in one of the newer translations. The A. V., except in familiar passages, is all but unintelligible, we fear, to the average modern reader. No church worker can read this letter alertly and, if possible, at one sitting, without acquiring a new sense of the glory of his office and a new zeal to give his very best "for God" and for God's people.

"Paul, an Apostle of Christ Jesus by the will of God" (1:1) — this opening note is drawn out through the entire letter. In fact, it can be called the theme of the letter. During Paul's Ephesian ministry Judaizing teachers had come to Corinth who sought to discredit the founder of the Corinthian congregation. Unscrupulously they libeled his character and denied his genuine Apostolic authority. Practically the whole letter constitutes the vindication of his Apostleship. In the last four chapters, known as "Paul's great invective," he answers his enemies quite directly. In the first seven chapters he does so more indirectly by supplying his friends, who form the majority in the Corinthian church, with grounds on which they may repel the attacks made by the base intruders.

In the first part of the letter there is a lengthy passage in which Paul's defense is quite complete and which submits to somewhat of an outline. The theme may be stated as "The Nature of Paul's Ministry." Dividing the material into nine sections and giving each a heading which states the dominant thought, or one of these dominant thoughts, we may say that this ministry is presented by Paul as (1) triumphant (2:12-17); (2) accredited (3:1-3); (3) glorious (3:4-18); (4) honest (4:1-6); (5) suffering (4:7-15); (6) hopeful (4:16—5:10); (7) dedicated (5:11-15); (8) representative (5:16-21); (9) approved (6:1-10).¹

Taking up now the first section (2:12-17), we would suggest to the reader first to read the passage in Greek and then in the R. S. V.

Paul's self-defense is "framed in a description of his journey from Asia to Macedonia, with Corinth as his destination. His experiences on this journey constitute the thread of the letter."² This is the

actual itinerary that he had projected in his First Letter (1 Cor. 16:5-9). In the meantime, as we learn from the writing before us (2 Cor. 1:15-16), he had revised his plan, telling the Corinthians that he intended to visit them first and then go on to Macedonia, from where he would return to give them thus double "pleasure" or "grace" (depending on whether we read *χαράν* or *χάριν*). But now arose the serious crisis which threatened to destroy Paul's work in Corinth. Paul thought it wise to refrain from a personal visit at this time and to send Titus in his stead to deal with the difficulty and reduce the rebellious persons to submission (2:13; 7:6-7, 13-15). Meanwhile he started from Ephesus in Asia to Macedonia, as originally planned. This change of plan was made the basis of the charge of levity, instability, and insincerity against him. Paul, it was said, was a yes-and-no man, whose word could not be trusted (cf. 1:17-20).

Coming to Troas, Paul found a good opening for missionary work. But his hope that Titus would meet him there on his return from Corinth was not fulfilled. The suspense concerning the state of affairs at Corinth became so intolerable to Paul that he threw up his work at Troas and crossed over to Macedonia, in order to meet Titus the sooner. This time he was not disappointed (7:5 ff.). The report of Titus about the result of his mission was so unexpectedly favorable that Paul, in a fervor of thankfulness and affection, at once began to dictate this letter, in order to make the reconciliation between him and the Corinthian converts complete and to rout his opponents for good and all.

The passage before us shows the torturing suspense of Paul at Troas. This comes out also in the surprising use of the perfect tense in v. 13: *οὐκ ἔσχηκα ἄνεσιν*. Since he wrote after hearing the good news from Titus, we would have expected the use of the aorist, *οὐκ ἔσχον*, "I got no relief." Instead, reliving the period of anxiety and tortured love just now happily ended, he says: "I have gotten no relief," just as though Titus' good news were too good to be true.³

We may be startled to read that Paul left the promising opening for new conquests for Christ at Troas. Probably he felt that it was "as necessary to secure and confirm old converts as to gain new ones." Besides, the work was begun at Troas, a nucleus for a con-

gregation was formed (v.13). Some months later Paul, was to spend a whole week with the flock there (Acts 20:6 ff.). Certainly the Christians at Corinth must have been struck with shame at the loss which their sinful disorders had entailed upon these people across the sea, robbing them of an Apostle's ministry; and if they could reflect at all, they must have felt the depth of his love for his unruly spiritual children.

At v.14 Paul suddenly breaks off his narrative and begins a doxology. We can imagine the surprise of the amanuensis when Paul so suddenly changed his line of thought and began to dictate the next words. We have looked ahead to chapter seven and seen the reason. So overwhelmed was Paul with thankfulness at the thought of the victory of God's cause at Corinth reported by Titus that he thought of the victory of the Gospel generally and his own God-given share in that triumph: τῷ δὲ θεῷ χάρις τῷ πάντοτε θριαμβεύοντι ἡμᾶς ἐν Χριστῷ.

There has been some dispute as to the precise meaning of θριαμβεύω here. This dispute is reflected in part in the difference of translation in the A.V. and the R.S.V. The A.V. renders: "Now thanks be unto God, which always *causeth us to triumph* in Christ."⁴ In this rendering, God makes the Apostles the *triumphatores*. The R.S.V. translates: "But thanks be to God, who in Christ always *leads us in triumph*." Here God is the *Triumphator*, while the translation leaves it open to regard the Apostles either as associates of His triumph, even as the victorious Roman *imperator* was attended by his staff and soldiers, or to regard the Apostles as God's captives on exhibition before the world.

The only other use of the word θριαμβεύειν in the N.T. is in Col.2:15. Here the way of Jesus to the Cross, by a magnificent paradox, is represented as God's triumphal procession: "He disarmed the principalities and powers and made a public example of them, triumphing over them in Him [i.e., Christ]" (R.S.V.), or "in it [i.e., the Cross]" (A.V.). In this Pauline passage the "principalities and powers" are definitely the *captives* of the triumphant God. There is no need and no reason for departing from this sense in our present passage. Some, it is true, would surrender the military metaphor and make the verb mean "to make a show of" or, still more colorless, "to lead about."⁵ But in Paul's

Rome-dominated world *triumphus, triumphare, triumphator* and the Greek equivalents must have been terms as common as *World Series* or *championship bout* in our American world, and there is no need to abandon the original coloring here. Nor should any Christian balk at the idea of the Apostle Paul or himself as captive in the heavenly Conqueror's train and thus an instrument of God's glory. Of course, in an ordinary Roman triumph the captives had no share in the victory. The victory was not only a victory *over* them, but a victory *against* them. But when God wins a victory over man and leads him captive in triumph, the victory *over* him is a victory *for* him; it is the beginning of all triumphs for him. Paul had once been an enemy of God in Christ; he had fought against Him in his own soul and in the Church, which he persecuted. God vanquished him at Damascus. The mighty man fell. The weapons of his warfare, his pride and self-righteousness, collapsed. He rose from the earth to be a slave of Christ. Indeed, Paul's characteristic phrase "slave of Christ" is a parallel to the concept of "captive" involved in our passage. Only as slave of Christ, Paul or any man is truly free, and only as God's captive, Paul or any man is truly victorious. "*To God* be thanks," Paul cries out, "who always leads me as His captive in His triumphal procession *in Christ*." "In Christ" the captive found victory, freedom, and work.

Of the new work "in Christ," Paul now speaks, again in picture language: "And through us spreads the fragrance of the knowledge of Him everywhere" (v. 14 b, R.S.V.) — καὶ τὴν ὁσμὴν τῆς γνώσεως αὐτοῦ φανεροῦντι δι' ἡμῶν ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ. Many interpreters hold that Paul is keeping up the picture of a Roman triumph. Goodspeed, for example, puts it thus: "He is like one of those censer bearers who in ancient processions, when the proconsul rode in state up to the amphitheater, fumigated and perfumed the ill-smelling streets before and around him. In God's triumphal procession Paul is such a functionary, spreading the perfume of the knowledge of him everywhere."⁶ In the following verses, then, which tell of the twofold effect of Gospel preaching, these interpreters give an interpretation something like this: "In a triumphal procession both the victors and the conquered captives all breathed the perfume of the same incense. To the victors the

fragrance was a symbol of present gladness and future safety, while to the captives it was a token of defeat and condemnation and a premonition of impending death." In connecting thus the mention of perfume with the picture of a Roman triumph, we would have Paul, in rapid succession, picture himself as captive (so at least in the view we have adopted), as censer bearer, and (v. 15) as the incense itself. It can be admitted that such rapid shifts in imagery are not uncongenial to the Oriental mind and to the mind of Paul, the Oriental. But by the same token we may see a totally different picture presented in vv. 14 b to 16. And this becomes advisable in view of what the archaeological expert Wissowa reports. He says that as far as he is aware the notice of censer bearers going in advance of the triumphal chariot occurs only once, in the description given by Appian in his *Punica* of the triumph of Scipio Africanus Minor. Since among the numerous descriptions of triumphs available to us this feature is mentioned only in this single reference of Appian (and he wrote about a century after Paul), Wissowa judges that the presence of the word "fragrance," even in the context of triumph, would not suggest this feature as having been in Paul's mind.⁷ Delling, in his recent article on ὁσμὴ,⁸ likewise sees no connection between "fragrance" and a triumphal procession. He sees in the background of ὁσμὴ, as connected with "knowledge," the widespread idea in the ancient world of the life-giving powers of the odors proceeding from certain natural objects. This originally physiological idea is then spiritualized. So, for example, in the apocryphal book of Wisdom (24:15) Σοφία (Wisdom) declares that she gives forth ὁσμὴν (fragrance) — like various plants and herbs that are then mentioned in the passage. The suggestion is here that Wisdom has the power to impart true life. This explanation of the origin of the peculiar phrase "the fragrance of knowledge" is attractive and fits in well with what follows.

Knowledge (γνῶσις), as usual in the Bible, is, on the divine side, God's own self-revelation; on the human side, man's committal of himself to that revelation. Practically, then, knowledge means Gospel, on the one hand; faith, on the other. Paul, God's victorious captive in God's triumphal procession over the highways and city streets of Asia Minor and the old Greek world, is God's instrument in diffusing⁹ the fragrance of the life-giving knowledge

of God's redemptive work in Christ wherever he goes, so that men enter into the life of living fellowship with God.

The metaphor of the fragrance of the knowledge of God is further explained in the next clause (v. 15 a): "For we are the aroma of Christ to God." So the R. S. V. renders the clause. We would slightly change this to read: "For we are Christ's aroma for God" (ὅτι Χριστοῦ εὐωδία ἐσμὲν τῷ θεῷ). The expression is difficult and has been much discussed.¹⁰ Paul uses the word εὐωδία in two other passages, both of them in the context of sacrifice, following the Septuagint usage. Eph. 5:2: "And walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us and hath given Himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savor [εἰς ὁσμὴν εὐωδίας]" (A. V.). Phil. 4:18: "I have all and abound; I am full, having received of Epaphroditus the things which were sent from you, an odor of sweet smell [ὁσμὴν εὐωδίας], a sacrifice acceptable, well pleasing to God" (A. V.). Thinking of this use of εὐωδία with reference to Christ's vicarious sacrifice and the Philippians' sacrifice of thanksgiving in the form of a monetary gift to Paul the prisoner, one would be inclined to explain our verse as Paul's application of the language of sacrifice to himself, designating his Apostolic calling as a sacrifice offered to God. So, indeed, Paul would have all Christians regard their lives (Rom. 12:1). There is, however, a difficulty in accepting this explanation. It leaves the phrase without inner connection with the picture in the preceding "fragrance of knowledge" and the following statement about the decisive and divisive effects of this "fragrance" diffused by his activity. Such inner connection, however, would be established if we work with Dellings' explanation of ὁσμή, to which we referred above, namely, the *life-giving powers* of certain odors. Such a life-giving ὁσμή proceeds from the knowledge of God in Christ Jesus. We think of the Lord's own word: "And this is life eternal, that they might know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent" (John 17:3). Paul himself has received this life from Christ. Through Him as God's instrument this fragrance is spread. And as transmitter of this life he calls himself "Christ's aroma for God." (We take Χριστοῦ as the genitive of source and τῷ θεῷ as the dative of interest.)

How power-packed are Paul's two pictures here of the Christian

preacher: Christ's triumphant captive, Christ's aroma for God — humbling and exalting at the same time. But awesome, too, his calling when the preacher considers the tremendous (the word comes from *tremere*, to tremble and quake) effects of his office to diffuse the fragrance of divine knowledge. Paul says: "We are the aroma of Christ to God among those who are being saved and among those who are perishing" (R. S. V.) — yes, "Christ's aroma for God" at all times, in every place, among all men, whether they will hear the message or not. Gospel is always good news, even when human perverseness and Satanic blindness will not have it so. "Behold, this Child is set for the fall and rising of many" (Luke 2:34). And so it has been from the beginning: the Magi and Herod, Nicodemus and Caiaphas, Peter and Judas, Barnabas and Ananias, Sergius Paulus the proconsul and Elymas the sorcerer. "To one," Paul continues, (we are) "a fragrance from death to death, to the other a fragrance from life to life" (v. 16 a, R. S. V.: οἷς μὲν ὁσμὴ ἐκ θανάτου εἰς θάνατον, οἷς δὲ ὁσμὴ ἐκ ζωῆς εἰς ζωὴν).

Not denying our inability to find the ultimate solution of the mystery of the different reactions to the "fragrance of the knowledge of God" diffused through Gospel preaching, we recognize that the general sense of this verse is clear enough. However, the precise meaning of the phrases ἐκ θανάτου and ἐκ ζωῆς with εἰς θάνατον and εἰς ζωὴν is a *crux interpretum*, like the similar phrase ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν in Rom. 1:17, and ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν in 2 Cor. 3:18. In the present case there is also a textual question. The *textus receptus* omits ἐκ both times. That simplifies the meaning. Taking the genitives as genitives of quality, one might translate with Moffatt: "to the one a *deadly* fragrance that makes for death, to the other a *vital* fragrance that makes for life."¹¹ But the twofold use of ἐκ must be allowed to stand in the text. It would be unprofitable to list all the guesses that have been put forth to explain the phrases. It will be sufficient to mention only a few typical explanations. Apparently the general view is that Paul indicates various degrees in the process of death and life to the final state of either. But death and life for Paul stand in absolute antithesis. He never suggests, nor does the Bible ever suggest, the possibility of men being more or less dead or more or less alive. Schlatter¹² and others explain the phrases un-Biblically with the

idea of a twofold predestination, death and life being the divine decrees carried into execution through the Gospel ministry. Delling, in the article referred to above, has a somewhat complicated interpretation. He starts with the second phrase ἐκ ζωῆς εἰς ζωὴν.¹³ Now, ὁσμὴ is life-giving power. The life here is the life from God communicated through the Gospel. That life is active in Paul and as herald of the Gospel he transmits this fragrance, this life, to others, to those that are saved. To them he thus proves a fragrance *from life to life*. Conversely, and comporting with the crisis character of the Gospel, Paul as its herald proves to be the judgment upon those who resist the Gospel, so that the death which hitherto characterized their existence becomes their final fate. From *spiritual* death they advance to *eternal* death (ἐκ θανάτου εἰς θάνατον). We wonder whether the simple Christians, or even learned Christians, at Corinth could have read all this at once out of Paul's words. The passage is rhetorical in character in a doxological setting. Hence we would suggest that we interpret these phrases as rhetorical, with something of the force of our expression "from A to Z," indicating the decisive result in either case, death or life. Whether we adopt the A. V. rendition ("the savor of death unto death," "the savor of life unto life") or that of the R. S. V. ("a fragrance from death to death," "a fragrance from life to life") or Moffatt's translation ("a deadly fragrance that makes for death . . . a vital fragrance that makes for life"), the result will be practically the same, we feel; for the average hearer (and Paul's Letters were written, in the first place, to be heard) will understand the phrases as underscoring the idea of death and the idea of life in either case.

Here the doxology ends and gives way to a very natural question: "Who is sufficient for these things?" (V. 16 b, R. S. V.) Note the Greek words: καὶ πρὸς ταῦτα τίς ἱκανός; The καὶ is not meaningless. It accepts the previous statement and intensifies the interrogative τίς. The force is: "Well, since that is the case, who, yes, who, is sufficient for these things? Who is equal to this responsibility? What kind of a minister ought he to be who preaches a Gospel which may be fatal to those who come into contact with it?" Paul with this question is preparing the way for his elaborate self-defense and his polemic against the teachers without conscience who had wrought chaos at Corinth for their selfish ends.

The answer to the question: "Who is sufficient?" is not stated, but it is implied in the next verse (v. 17): "For we are not, like so many, peddlers of God's word" (R. S. V.), οὐ γὰρ ἐσμεν ὡς οἱ πολλοί. The γὰρ indicates the answer: "We are sufficient for these things, for," etc. Usually πολλοί with the article means "the majority." But apparently the article is more demonstrative here, referring to the teachers who were misleading the converts at Corinth, "that big crowd." "We are not like that big crowd καπηλεύοντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ." The verb καπηλεύω means "to be a κάπηλος." The κάπηλος was the *retail dealer*, the *buckster*, as contrasted with the importer or producer, especially the retailer of wine.¹⁴ The wine dealers must often have adulterated the wine with water so that both the noun and the verb gradually got an evil connotation. This has led the A. V. to its rendering, "which corrupt the word of God." The R. S. V. rendering gives the predominant force of the term: "peddling the word of God." That means, preaching for pecuniary gain, for selfish ends, making preaching one's racket, seeking not *you*, but *yours*.¹⁵ To seek one's living from the Gospel, looking at preaching as a profession on a par with other gainful professions, is a devilish caricature of that "living of the Gospel" which Christ has ordained for those who preach the Gospel (1 Cor. 9:14). The idea of corrupting, adulterating, the Word of God is not entirely absent in καπηλεύοντες. That is shown in 4:2, where we read the parallel phrase δολοῦντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, the verb δολόω expressly meaning "to adulterate." Religious racketeers generally are not orthodox in doctrine. It doesn't pay. But, as stated, preaching for pecuniary gain is the chief idea here.

In contrast to the belly-serving pseudo-apostles whom Paul hits here, Paul says (2 Cor. 2:17 b), and here we prefer the A. V.: "but as of sincerity, but as of God, in the sight of God, speak we in Christ," ἀλλ' ὡς ἐξ εὐλικρινείας, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐκ θεοῦ κατέναντι τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ λαλοῦμεν. Four impressive prepositional phrases, one after the other. Four body blows in succession, one stouter than the other, against the opponents. Four searchlight beams, one brighter than the other, probing our hearts.

"We genuine Apostles of Christ," says Paul, "speak ὡς ἐξ εὐλικρινείας." With ὡς here and in the next clause there is an

ellipsis: "But we speak as (one speaks who speaks) of sincerity, ἐξ εὐλικρινείας." The most probable etymology of this word is to derive it from εἴλη (related to ἥλιος), "the warmth of the sun, sunlight," and the verb κρίνειν, "to examine"; hence, as B. Weiss has well paraphrased the term: "an uprightness which even if examined by the most brilliant light of the sun will show no defects." *Sincerity*, a word with a different etymological picture but of kindred force, is the best single term in English for the quality. This quality as the *subjective* aspect of the true minister's life pervades the first seven chapters of this letter, though the term itself occurs only twice (see also 1:12). — Let us ask ourselves: Are we sincere? Do we ring true?

Next, "as of God speak we," ὡς ἐκ θεοῦ λαλοῦμεν. We speak as (one speaks who speaks) from God, whose speaking has its *objective* source in God, that is, whose speaking is inspired by God.¹⁶ We cannot claim the same inspiration for ourselves which Paul claimed. But we have an inspired Bible. — Let us ask ourselves: Is that the source of all our theology and teaching?

Next, "in the sight of God speak we," κατέναντι τοῦ θεοῦ λαλοῦμεν, conscious of the fact that God is witness to what we speak. — Let us ask ourselves: Do we speak with that awareness?

Finally, "in Christ we speak," ἐν Χριστῷ λαλοῦμεν. There is the climax. "In Christ we speak," and "if any man be in Christ, he is a new creation; the old has passed away, behold, the new has come. All this is from God, who through Christ reconciled us to Himself and gave us the ministry of reconciliation" (2 Cor. 5: 17-18. R. S. V.). In Christ we speak, as members of His body, as branches in the Vine. And the branches bear fruit by being in the Vine, and in no other way. — Let us ask ourselves: Are we in Christ?

To come back to the question of v. 16: "Who is sufficient for these things, for this ministry, tremendous in its responsibilities?" "We are sufficient," Paul answers by implication in the words that follow. "We are sufficient," he says expressly in the next section (3:4); but in due humility he declares: "Our sufficiency is of God." None are sufficient except those whom God has made so. And the evidence for this God-made sufficiency on our part is the ability to make the closing words of our passage our very own:

"We are not, like so many, peddlers of God's word; but as men of sincerity, as men who have received God's inspired message, in the sight of God, in Christ, do we speak." Only such a minister has the right to call himself "God's triumphant captive — Christ's aroma for God."

NOTES

1. This outline follows the suggestion given in the *Scofield Reference Bible*.
2. O. Moe, *The Apostle Paul*, Minneapolis: August, 1950, p. 375.
3. It is possible to take this perfect in its later use as an aorist, Blass-Debrunner, par. 343; but there is no need to do so here.
4. Compare Luther, who however, drops the picture of a triumphal procession: "Aber Gott sei gedankt, der uns allezeit den Sieg gibt in Christo."
5. See Moulton-Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek N.T.*, p. 293.
6. E. J. Goodspeed, *Paul*, 1947, p. 141.
7. See H. Lietzmann, *Handbuch zum N.T.: An die Korinther*, 1907, p. 175 f.
8. Kittel, *Theologisches Woerterbuch*, V, 494.
9. The verb φανεροῦν, "to manifest, disclose," in connection with ὁσμή, strikes one as peculiar. In such connections the Septuagint usually uses διδόναι. The choice of the verb is here, of course, determined by γνώσεως.
10. See Kittel, II, 808, εὐωδία; V, 494, ὁσμή. Note that ὁσμή by itself is a neutral term, which gets its connotation of "evil" or "pleasant" odor from its context, while εὐωδία, as the etymology shows, is a sweet odor.
11. Moffatt uses von Soden's text, which has the double ἐκ. It is hardly to be believed that Moffatt took the prepositional phrase as the equivalent of a genitive of quality. Such equation has no grammatical validity. More likely, Moffatt gives a free translation readily understood.
12. Schlatter, *Der Bote Gottes*, 1934, p. 497.
13. This is warranted, since Paul is using the rhetorical chiasmic structure (ABBA). Without chiasm the passage would read: "To those who are being saved we are a fragrance ἐκ ζ. εἰς ζωὴν; to those who are perishing we are a fragrance ἐκ θ. εἰς θάνατον."
14. In Is. 1:22, where the Hebrew text is translated: "Thy silver is become dross, thy wine mixed with water," the LXX has: οἱ κάπηλοι σου μίσγουσιν τὸν οἶνον ὕδατι, "Thy hucksters mix their wine with water."
15. In the *Didache* (12, 5) such racketeers are called by the bitter term "Christ-traffickers," Χριστέμποροι.
16. Compare 2 Peter 1:21, where Nestle gives this Greek text: ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι ἐλάλησαν ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἀνθρώποι. The R. S. V. gives a splendid translation: "Men moved by the Holy Spirit spoke from God." In the light of this parallel ἐκ θεοῦ λαλοῦμεν in our passage is better translated with "inspired by God" than with "commissioned by God," as the R. S. V. renders it.

St. Louis, Mo.

Luke 17: 20-21

in Recent Investigations

By PAUL M. BRETSCHER

THIS is the significant passage recorded only by Luke and rendered in the KJ version: "When He was demanded of the Pharisees when the Kingdom of God should come, He answered them and said: The Kingdom of God cometh not with observation; neither shall they say, Lo, here! or, Lo, there! for, behold, the Kingdom of God is within you." The passage poses a number of linguistic and exegetical difficulties. It raises such questions as: What did the Pharisees believe the Kingdom of God to be? What did Jesus have in mind when He used that term? What is the precise meaning of the phrase "with observation" (μετὰ παρατηρήσεως)? What is the meaning of ἐντὸς ὑμῶν? What is the force of ἐστίν? Is the consideration that ἐστίν follows rather than precedes ἐντὸς ὑμῶν of any determining significance? Does the passage constitute a complete unit of thought permitting an interpretation which totally disregards the larger context, especially Luke 17:22-37? Who are the ὑμῶν in the phrase ἐντὸς ὑμῶν?

Some years ago this journal published an article of mine dealing with this same passage.¹ My chief interest in the passage at that time was the phrase ἐντὸς ὑμῶν. I came to the conclusion that in view of the immediate context in which the phrase occurs, it means "among," "in your midst." Since that time I gathered further data on the entire passage and enlarged the scope of my inquiry. It is the burden of this paper to present an overview of these findings, with special reference again, however, to the phrase ἐντὸς ὑμῶν. Following this overview, I shall list, and adduce the evidence for, various renderings of the phrase. In compiling the findings, I am mindful of the need of following sound hermeneutical principles. These are well expressed in the following summary: "Any interpretation of this saying must, if it is to be valid, satisfy four conditions: it must be philologically unobjectionable; it must not part company with the entire tradition of the Church, or, if it does so, it must be able to explain why the true rendering was so long over-

looked; it must make sense in its context; it must not contradict the whole tenor of the Gospel teaching about the Kingdom."

Colin H. Roberts, the author of the above summary, recently contributed a careful investigation of Luke 17:20-21.² He plunges into his discussion with the challenging observation:

If of all of Jesus' teaching about the Kingdom this one paragraph had alone survived, no Greek scholar would have thought of rendering the last sentence except in the way familiar by usage and sanctioned by a tradition of exegesis unbroken until modern times, "The Kingdom of Heaven is within you." Equally there is hardly a modern theologian — whether reacting against the individualism of the nineteenth century or influenced by theories of "realized eschatology" or simply awake to the very real difficulties of the older view — who does not translate, "The Kingdom of Heaven is among you." And yet the objections to both renderings are substantial, if not (as I think) insuperable.

Following this introductory blast, to which one need not object too seriously — though Roberts himself admits the inadequacy of his simplification in several footnotes — the author proceeds to demonstrate, on the basis of some reasonable evidence, that the Savior's reply to the question of the Pharisees can only mean:

The Kingdom does not come at all if you strain your eyes to look for it, because it is with you, in your possession, *if you want it* [italics mine], now. To ask whether the Kingdom is external or internal, a state of mind or a state of society, a process or a catastrophic event is (in this context) to ask the wrong question; it is no wonder, then, that both answers are wrong, viz., "within you" and "among you" or rather partial and incomplete. Both may in a sense be right. It is a present reality, *but only if you wish it to be so* [italics mine]. The misconception to be removed is that the Kingdom is something external to men, independent of their volitions and actions; it is a conditional possession.

Another recent and very thorough investigation of Luke 17:20-21 is that by Bent Noack.³ This author examines interpretations of this passage which have come down to us from early Christianity, the early Middle Ages, the Reformation period, the eighteenth and the nineteenth century, and the period since 1890. A hurried glance into Noack's materials will prove helpful. He informs us, to begin with, that the Old Latin texts as well as the Vulgate from Jerome

to Clement all translate ἐντὸς ὑμῶν with "intra vos." The Latin translation reads: "Non venit regnum Dei cum observatione; neque dicent: Ecce hic, aut ecce illic. Ecce enim regnum Dei intra vos est." Noack contends that "intra" must mean "within." Of the Syriac translations, so Noack continues, the Peshito renders the phrase ἐντὸς ὑμῶν "within you," whereas the Curetonian and Sinaitic Syriac manuscripts render it "among you." Of the Fathers, he quotes relevant passages from Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, Peter of Alexandria (d. 311), Athanasius, Gregory of Nyssa, Cyril of Alexandria, Theophylact, and Euthymios Zigabenos. Christian writers representing the early Middle Ages are Bede, Bruno Astensis, and Strabo. The Reformation and Renaissance period is represented by Faber Stapulensis, Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, and Flacius. Catholic writers of the seventeenth century quoted by Noack are Maldonatus and Cornelius a Lapide. Reformed writers of the same period include John Piscator and Hugo Grotius. The eighteenth century is represented by Hanneken, Gnilius, Limborchius, Bengel, and Koecher. The nineteenth century until 1890 comes in for only slight consideration. The period from 1890 to our day includes such well-known names as Johannes Weiss, O. Schmoller, Bousset, Loisy, M. Dibelius, H. D. Wendland, A. Schlatter, K. L. Schmidt, Rud. Otto, R. Frick, B. H. Streeter, C. H. Dodd, and C. J. Cadoux.

In the last part of the book, Noack presents his own interpretation of Luke 17:20-22. He makes much of the wider context, that is, Luke 17:22-37, and concludes (1) that ἐστὶν is a real present, which means that, according to Jesus, the Kingdom has arrived and is in operation; (2) that ἐντὸς means "inter," that is, "among," "in the midst of." He justifies his translation with the argument: "If the meaning 'within you' were the correct interpretation, this statement could not express the opposite of v. 22. For the disciples can indeed preserve the kingdom of God 'within' themselves even though the external conditions about them might change. If, however, the Kingdom is 'among' them, it can disappear, can again become hid, or the manifestation of its powers can cease. The transition of v. 21 presupposes some such event." Noack believes that Luke speaks of the Kingdom as having arrived, as being present, and as coming in the clouds of heaven. His paraphrase of

Luke 17:20-24 shows the close connection which, according to him, exists between vv. 20-21 and vv. 22-24.

Following this brief summary of the studies by Roberts and Noack, let us now soberly face up to some of the problems which interpreters of Luke 17:20-21, both ancient and modern, have bequeathed to us. Let us, to begin with, return to the challenging statement thrown out by Roberts and quoted above. Roberts claims: "No Greek scholar would have thought of rendering the last sentence [in Luke 17:21] except in the way familiar by usage and sanctioned by a tradition of exegesis almost unbroken until modern times, 'The Kingdom of Heaven is within you.' . . . There is hardly a modern theologian . . . who does not translate, 'The Kingdom of Heaven is among you.'" To us this appears to be a false antithesis. Without going to the trouble of ferreting out a few Greek scholars who did not render ἐντός with "within" and a few modern theologians who do not render ἐντός with "among," one is safe in supposing that there have been Greek scholars who were also theologians and that there are some modern theologians who are also Greek scholars.

But, in all seriousness, what does "within" mean? As I tried to show in my previous article,⁴ the English "within" is a flexible term and allows for shades of meaning which come perilously close to "among." Again, what is the dividing line between "inter" and "intra" in Latin? May one say with absolute finality that "inter" suggests a partial and "intra" a complete limitation? Shall one suppose that Ethelbert Stauffer made a serious blunder when he remarks that Luther with his *inwendig in euch* set himself in direct opposition to the "intra" of the Vulgate?⁵ Shall one say that Lenski made the same mistake?⁶ For it must be remembered that the Latin "intra" is indeed the standard translation of ἐντός, but whether it always meant "within, inside of," to the Latin writers, is another question. All we know is that much evidence from Latin writers points in the direction that they understood "intra" in the Luke passage as meaning *in cordibus*.

But even this is not the most serious consideration facing the student who wrestles with ἐντός and "intra." The greatest difficulty confronts him when he considers what early Church Fathers believed the Kingdom of God to be of which they wrote that it was

"intra vos." For a discovery of differing views of the Kingdom of God held by Christians from the Apostolic age to St. Augustine, one need only consult Robert Frick's monograph.⁷ Tertullian believed the Kingdom of God to be the *praeceptum Dei*. He interprets Luke 17:21: "In praecepto est Dei regnum."⁸ In one passage, Origen suggests that the Kingdom of God in us is in opposition to the kingdom of sin in sinners.⁹ For Athanasius, the Kingdom in us is Christ. For Faber Stapulensis, the Kingdom "within us" is *fides Christi, doctrina spiritus, et nova in ipso creatura, et ipse (quod maximum est) qui per fidem jam in ipsis habitabat*.¹⁰ For Calvin, the Kingdom "within us" is *interior et spiritualis animae renovatio*.¹¹ Other interpretations of "Kingdom of God" could be cited. But these will suffice to indicate that their interpretation of the term "Kingdom of God" may well have determined, in part or wholly, for Christian writers in the early and in later periods a preference for "within."

Roberts' statement, "There is hardly a modern theologian . . . who does not translate, 'The Kingdom of God is among you,'" creates the impression that the translation "among you" is of very recent origin. As Noack shows, that translation may be traced already in Cyril of Alexandria,¹² although it seems to have become firmly established only since the seventeenth century. Noack quotes both John Piscator and Hugo Grotius as having understood ἐντός in the sense of "among."¹³ In the eighteenth century, "among" becomes a widely accepted translation. Noack quotes, as a telling instance, Limborchius, who writes: "Sensus non est: regnum Dei tantum est internum, et in cordibus vestris; sed in medio vestro, seu inter vos."¹⁴ Bengel belongs to this period. He is frequently referred to as one who favored the meaning "among." In justice to Bengel it must be said, however, that he did not deny the meaning of ἐντός to be "intra." He preferred "inter" merely because the ὑμῶν involves the Jewish people.¹⁵ In any case, a marked preference for "among" is evident throughout the eighteenth century. The reason for the shift was, as Noack indicates, an interpretation of "Kingdom of God" different from interpretations of previous centuries.

Efforts to ascertain the true meaning of ἐντός ὑμῶν was not a burning issue in the first ninety years of the last century. This may

be due largely to the fact that in this period the concept of the nature of the Kingdom of God was not closely scrutinized. There were those, of course, who favored the rendition of ἐντός ὑμῶν with "among you." Others, like Godet,¹⁶ defended the traditional position. A fresh interest in the meaning of ἐντός begins to appear, however, in the early nineties of the past century with the publication in 1892 by Johannes Weiss of his *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes* (2d ed., 1900). In this work, Luke 17:20-21 plays an important role. It continued to do so in the many volumes which in some way or other took up the challenge raised by Weiss. Whether one seconded the "futuristic eschatology"¹⁷ proposed by Weiss, as did Schweitzer, Bousset, and Juelicher, or whether one championed a "realized eschatology" of the Kingdom proposed by C. H. Dodd,¹⁸ or whether one took a mediating position and held that with Jesus' ministry the Kingdom of God "broke through," "dawned," and that His ministry on earth was God's way of establishing His rule over and among men, but that the full revelation of the Kingdom of God lay in the future, in any case, interpreters could not escape an encounter with Luke 17:20-21. Since the Kingdom of God came more and more to mean God's gracious rule among men and since this Kingship of God was identified with the person, life, and activity of Jesus—in particular with His casting out of demons, His preaching of the Gospel, His signs and miracles—interpreters of Luke's Gospel in ever-growing numbers adopted the interpretation "among."¹⁹ It would be a most interesting study to trace the shift from "within" to "among" in the past fifty years of leading interpreters of the Gospel of Luke. I myself have discovered this shift in Adolf Schlatter²⁰ and William Manson.²¹ Interpreters who have expressed themselves on the meaning of ἐντός within the last quarter century and who interpret the phrase "among" are: Walter Bauer in the 3d edition of his Greek-German dictionary of the New Testament, Ernst Lohmeyer,²² K. L. Schmidt,²³ Rudolf Otto,²⁴ Ethelbert Stauffer,²⁵ A. G. Hebert,²⁶ J. Lagrange,²⁷ K. H. Rengstorff,²⁸ and Miller Burrows.²⁹ Small wonder that the Revised Standard Version translates ἐντός ὑμῶν "in the midst of you." There are, of course, still those who prefer the rendering "within," as B. H. Streeter,³⁰ J. M. Creed,³¹ and Robert Frick.³² Those who are very dogmatic in their opinion that ἐντός cannot but mean "among,"

will do well to investigate the argument in favor of "within" advanced by F. Godet.³³ As far as I know, no one has ever successfully met Godet's arguments.

It remains now to list, and to provide the evidence for, the several interpretations of ἐντός which have been proposed. For the sake of convenience we shall present them under four headings.

1. "WITHIN"

This rendition rests on solid philological ground. The passages from classical Greek commonly adduced in support of "among" are, as Roberts shows, not altogether convincing. The two passages most often cited are from Xenophon. The first is from the chapter of the *Anabasis* describing the conduct of the Greek guards of Cyrus' camp after the defeat at Cunaxa (*Anab.* I, 10, 3). In this passage, the meaning of ἐντός may well be, however, "within their lines" or, possibly, "within their power." In the second passage, from the *Hellenica* (II, 3, 19), ἐντός has its common meaning of "within the limits of." Roberts makes bold to write, "No other passage from a classical Greek author need come into consideration." He notes also that E. Mayser, in his grammar of Greek papyri,³⁴ cites twenty examples of ἐντός, every one having the meaning "within."

The meaning "within" is supported also, as Godet points out, by the position of the phrase ἐντός ὑμῶν in the context. He also notes that ἐντός always includes a contrast to the idea "without." Who could the object of an implied ἐκτός be? Certainly not, so he argues, the Gentiles, since there is no reference to the Gentiles in the passage.

There is, finally, the weight of sacred tradition reaching all the way back to the Old Latin translations which render ἐντός with "intra," granting, of course, that "intra" was always used by the Latin writers in the sense of "within," that is, *in cordibus*.

Above all, those who favor the meaning "within" find powerful support for their position in the contrast which they maintain exists between μετὰ παρατηρήσεως and ἐντός ὑμῶν. They like to paraphrase the passage to read: "The Kingdom of God will not come in such a way that it can be observed, for the Kingdom of God is 'within,' 'in the heart,' and therefore lies outside the realm of sense experience."

2. "AMONG," "IN THE MIDST OF"

This rendering finds some support, as even Roberts admits, in the Symmachus translation of the Old Testament. Roberts cites three passages from Symmachus: Lam. 1:3; Ps. 87:16; and Ps. 140:5, which appear to require the translation "among." He concludes his investigation of these passages with the observation: "Although in all these passages ἐντός still retains something of its limiting sense, 'among' is undeniably a legitimate translation. . . . The explanation of this anomaly is probably to be found in the ambiguity of the corresponding Hebrew preposition, which may mean either 'within' or 'among' and would explain his [Symmachus'] choice of ἐντός."³⁵

Other evidence which favors "among" is the widely accepted identification of the Kingdom of God in the Synoptic Gospels with the life and ministry of Jesus. Jesus is the αὐτοβασιλεία, an expression coined by Origen.³⁶ In Him God is manifesting both His grace and His power.

The point is also made that Jesus certainly did not mean to say that the Kingdom of God is "within" the Pharisees, His bitter enemies. The attempt to universalize the ὑμῶν is ruled out, so the champions of "among" say, by the consideration that in Luke 17:22 Jesus is expressly directing Himself to His disciples.

One also frequently meets with the contention that elsewhere in the Gospel it is man who enters the Kingdom, not the Kingdom into man. This has always seemed to us a very powerful argument. It is met in part, however, by Godet, who notes: "In giving to ἐντός the meaning 'within' we are led back to the idea expressed in the answer of Jesus to Nicodemus: Except a man be *born again*, he cannot *see* the Kingdom of God."

Further evidence for the rendition "among" is supplied by Noack, who, after a thorough examination of Luke 17:21-37, concludes that the larger context demands the rendition "among."

Finally, a deep-seated prejudice obviously causes some interpreters to defend "among." They seem to be so disturbed at what happened to the "within" in the theology of Ritschl and his followers that they will have nothing to do with any interpretation which centers the Kingdom of God in man's heart. These concerns are not altogether unfounded. To appreciate what has happened

to the concept "Kingdom of God" in the course of the Church's history, one need only read Robert Frick's monograph. It is so easy, also in our own day, to forget that the emphasis in the term "Kingdom of God" lies not on "Kingdom," or, if one prefers, on "Kingship," but rather on "God." How often has man disavowed *God's* rule and substituted for it *man's rule* and identified, or came close to identifying, the Kingdom of God with the kingdom of man.

A final note. Those who render ἐντός with "among" are frequently much concerned about the force of ἐστίν. Some regard the ἐστίν as an "apocalyptic present" and interpret the saying of the Savior to mean: "When the Kingdom of God comes, it will be there *all of a sudden*." So Bultmann, who observes, "Die Gottes-herrschaft ist mit einem Schlage unter euch." Others regard the ἐστίν as a real present and translate the passage, "The Kingdom of God is already present among you."

3. "WITHIN YOUR POSSESSION, IF . . ."

This translation of ἐντός ὑμῶν, which Roberts favors, is not altogether new. The conditional element read into the passage is found already in Tertullian, who comments, "Quis non ita interpretabitur: intra vos est, id est in manu, in potestate vestra, si audiat, si faciat Dei praeceptum?"³⁷ Roberts quotes other passages from the Fathers. Origen, for instance, interprets the Kingdom of God in some passages as a potentiality in the soul of man, the grain of seed which may or may not come to fruition. In a homily on Numbers, Origen writes: "Sed intra vos est salutis occasio sicut et Dominus dixit, ecce enim regnum Dei intra vos est; intra vos namque est conversionis facultas."³⁸ A passage from Cyril of Alexandria which supports Origen's interpretation is especially significant. The passage reads: μὴ γὰρ δὴ χρόνους ἐρωτᾶτε, φησί . . . σπουδάσατε δὲ μᾶλλον τυχεῖν αὐτῆς, ἐντός γὰρ ὑμῶν ἐστὶ τοῦτέστιν ἐν ταῖς ὑμετέροις προαιρέσεσι, καὶ ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ κεῖται τὸ λαβεῖν αὐτήν· ἔξεστι γὰρ ἀνθρώπῳ παντί. . .³⁹ An interpretation of ἐντός ὑμῶν similar to that of Cyril may be found also in J. Maldonatus, the Catholic commentator, whose commentary on the Gospels appeared in 1629. Maldonatus writes: "*Qua poterant*, si vellent, Christum recipere." Plummer, who calls attention to this interpretation, adds the laconic remark: "This is translating ἐντός ὑμῶν 'within you,' and interpreting 'within you' as much the same as

'among you.' If they had *not* received Christ or the Kingdom, it was not yet within them."⁴⁰

In further support of his position, Roberts marshals some, in any case, interesting evidence from several papyri in which ἐντός ὑμῶν may be rendered, so he believes, "in the possession of," "in the hands of," or a similar phrase.

The question is in order, "Does not this interpretation of ἐντός ὑμῶν violate the spirit of the Gospel records?" Roberts is well aware of the difficulty. He meets the argument (unsuccessfully, we believe) by saying:

Elsewhere in the Gospels the Kingdom is something that can be received; something to be sought for like the pearl of great price; something that belongs to some people and not to others. Ask and it shall be given unto you; seek and you shall find; knock and it shall be opened unto you. For everyone that asks receives and he who seeks finds, and to him that knocks it shall be opened.

4. THE "ELLIPSIS" THEORY

According to this theory, which was proposed within recent years by Harald Riesenfeld and Allen Wikren,⁴¹ the phrase ἐντός ὑμῶν presupposes an ellipsis, although I have been unable to discover what the ellipsis might be. Wikren refers to the Symmachus translations of Ps. 87:5; Lam. 1:3; and Job 18:19, where ἐντός occurs and where, in his opinion, an ellipsis seems most likely. Let us examine Ps. 87:5. The LXX text reads ἐν νεκροῖς ἐλεύθερος, whereas the Symmachus text has ἐντός νεκρῶν ἐλεύθερος. Wikren comments: "Since Symmachus' translation is in general characterized by a comparatively free and idiomatic Greek style, I should not hesitate to see the indicated ellipsis here. In this instance it might also have been suggested by the Common Greek phrase ἐν Ἀίδου. The emphasis in the passage is upon the place of the dead, so that a meaning like 'house,' or 'abode,' or 'circle' is entirely appropriate. While the translation 'among' is possible, it does not convey the exact force of ἐντός."

Though one might grant the possibility of an ellipsis having occurred on the Old Testament passages cited by Wikren because of the variant readings in the LXX and Symmachus, it must be remembered that there exists no variant for the phrase in Luke. To read an ellipsis into this phrase seems, therefore, to us a daring

soluti
preta
Fathe
ellips
W
trust,
Savio
into
lead
of G

1. Co
2. "T
- 19
3. D
- Br
- U
4. O
5. D
- "I
- 'ir
6. R
- Co
7. D
- O
- W
8. Q
9. Ib
10. Ib
11. Ib
12. Ib
13. Ib
14. Ib
15. Ib
- ter
- M
- co
- M
16. F
- Fr
17. Fo
- W
- p
18. T
- an
- siv
19. A
- se
- M
20. In
- St
- ko

solution of the difficulty unless one supposes that the Latin interpretation *in cordibus*, which often appears in the writings of the Fathers as an interpretation of *intra vos*, still reflects the alleged ellipsis in ἐν τῷ ὑμῶν. But this is an idle speculation.

We have come to the end of our investigation, though not, we trust, to the end of our interest in the weighty words spoken by the Savior in Luke 17:20-21. Further patient and prayerful research into the precise meaning of these words will, we are persuaded, lead us to a deeper appreciation of the mysteries of the Kingdom of God.

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY, 1944, pp. 730—36.
2. "The Kingdom of God (Lk. XVII, 21)" in *Harvard Theological Review*, 1948, pp. 1—8.
3. *Das Gottesreich bei Lukas. Eine Studie zu Luk. 17, 20-24.* Series "Symbolae Biblicae Upsaliensis, Supplementhaefthen till Svensk Exegetisk Arsbok, 10." Uppsala, 1948.
4. *Op. cit.*, p. 730.
5. *Die Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, 4te Aufl., Guetersloh, 1948, p. 264: "Luther hat, entgegen der Vulgata, die 'intra vos' schreibt, uebersetzt: 'inwendig in euch.'"
6. R. C. H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Mark's and St. Luke's Gospels.* Columbus, Ohio, 1934, p. 555.
7. *Die Geschichte des Reich-Gottes-Gedankens in der alten Kirche bis zu Origenes und Augustin* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift fuer die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 6). Giessen, 1928.
8. Quoted by Noack, *op. cit.*, p. 8.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 9.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 16.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 19.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 13.
13. *Ibid.*, pp. 21—22.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 24.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 26. The passage in the *Gnomon* reads: "Non debetis spectare in tempora futura, neque in loca remota, nam intra vos est regnum: sicut rex Messias est in medio vestri (Joh. 1, 26 et 12, 35). *Intra non respectu cordis singulorum pharisaeorum — sed respectu totius populi Judaeci. Rex, Messias, adeoque regnum, est praesens: videtis et auditis.*"
16. F. Godet, *A Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke.* Tr. from the 2d French ed. by D. Cusin. 3d ed. Edinburgh, 1879. Vol. II, p. 194.
17. For a good summary of the interest in eschatology since the appearance of Weiss' book, see George S. Duncan, *Son of Man.* New York, 1949, p. 47 ff. Duncan avoids both extremes.
18. *The Kingdom of God and History.* Essays by C. H. Dodd, Paul Tillich, and others. London, 1938. The essay by Dodd is a clear and comprehensive statement of his position.
19. A brief but useful chapter on the meaning of "Kingdom of God" in conservative theological thought may be found in Archibald M. Hunter, *The Message of the New Testament.* Philadelphia, 1944, pp. 52—56.
20. In his *Erlaeuterungen zum Neuen Testament*, Bd. I, 2te Aufl., Calw und Stuttgart, 1918, Schlatter expressed himself as follows: "Gottes Herrschaft kommt nicht so, dass man ihr zuschauen kann, und man wird nicht sagen:

sieh! hier ist sie oder dort. Denn sieh! Gottes Herrschaft ist inwendig in euch," sagt Jesus. Die Pharisaeer fragen sehnsuechtig: wann kommt sie wohl, Gottes herrliche Offenbarung und grosse Gnadenstat? spaehen, ob sie sich noch nicht zeigt, und verpassen sie bei all diesem Spaehen, Rechnen und Sehnen. Sie geschieht nicht so wie der prunkvolle Einzug eines irdischen Koenigs als ein Schauspiel, dem man zuschauen kann. Gottes Herrschen fasst den Menschen inwendig, kommt dort zu ihm und macht sich ihm dort mit seiner Gnade offenbar. Er selbst ist es, der sich dort uns gegenwaertig macht mit seiner ganzen Gottesmacht, in deren Hand Himmel und Erde, Leib und Geist leben. Aber all dies ist von seiner stillen Unsichtbarkeit umschlossen, bietet sich uns inwendig dar, regiert uns von dort und pflanzt dort in unserer verborgenen, inwendigen Gestalt das Leben. Denn Gottes Gnade kommt durch das Wort zu uns im Glauben an den Menschensohn (pp. 555—56).

In his *Das Evangelium des Lukas*, however, which appeared in 1931, Schlatter rejects the translation "inwendig in euch." He says on p. 392: "Gottes Herrschaft kommt nicht erst einst, sondern ist schon gegenwaertig mitten im Kreise derer, die noch fragen, wann sie kommt."

21. In his *Bruce Lectures*, delivered in 1914 and published in 1918 under the title *Christ's View of the Kingdom of God*, Manson comments: "We should understand Jesus to say: You are looking outwards for the New Heaven and the New Earth. In reality they exist within. Every man has potentially within him the New Heaven and the New Earth. The Kingdom of God is within you." (P. 82.)

In his commentary on the Gospel of Luke, published in 1930, Manson writes: "The Pharisees see no immediate sign of that divine event which Jesus declares to be at hand. Jesus' answer is that his questioners look for proofs in every direction except the right one. The Pharisees expect external signs—the Greek suggests the quest of astronomical or other evidence—by which the nearness of the end may be computed. Such methods of divination were fostered by apocalyptic literature and would be familiar to Jesus' hearers. Jesus on the other hand declares that such evidence will be forever lacking. No one will say: 'Here it is' or 'There it is,' for all this signifies a looking away from the fact that the Reign of God is in your midst." (P. 196.)

22. *Das Vater-Unser*. 2te Aufl. Goettingen, 1947, p. 70: "Das Reich Gottes ist mitten unter euch. . . . Dies Wort ist nicht zu Anhaengern Jesu, sondern zu den Pharisaeern gesagt."
23. See article on βασιλεία in Kittel's *Theo. Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Vol. I, p. 587: "Die Gottesherrschaft ist mitten unter euch. Luther uebersetzt hier das ἐντός ὑμῶν falsch."
24. *Reich Gottes und Menschensohn*. 2te Aufl. Muenchen, 1940, p. 98, where Otto writes: "Ein markantes Logion, von einer Praezision und unmittelbaren Deutlichkeit, die von keinem andern Jesusworte uebertroffen wird. Es hat eine handgreifliche gar nicht misszuverstehende Pointe in den Worten: Siehe, das Reich Gottes ist in eurer Mitte."
25. *Op. cit.*, p. 103: "Menschensohn und Gottesherrschaft gehoeren bereits in Daniel 7 zusammen. Jesus nimmt den Menschensohntitel fuer sich in Anspruch. Er verkuendet den Anbruch der Gottesherrschaft (Mt. 4, 17; 11, 12). Er fasst beides zusammen und erlaert: In, mit und unter dem Kommen des Menschensohn kommt die Gottesherrschaft. 'Denn siehe, das Reich Gottes ist mitten unter euch.' Es ist schon da, in seiner Person, in seinem Werk."
26. *The Throne of David*, London, 1948, p. 156, where Hebert paraphrases Luke 17:21 as follows: "You Pharisees are watching for the Kingdom of God, and you are sure that you will be the first to greet it when it comes

and say, Lo, here! But you are wrong: not in looking for it, but in the assumption that when it comes you will be able to recognize it. And it has come and it is in your midst, and you have not had eyes to see."

27. *Evangile selon Saint Luc*, 7th ed., Paris, 1948, p. 460: "A la question: quand vient le règne? Jésus répond: il est déjà parmi vous."
28. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Das Neue Testament Deutsch). 5te Aufl. Goettingen, 1949, p. 195: "Dies Wort ist zu verstehen von Jesu Bewusstsein her, dass in ihm Gottes Messias bereits gekommen ist (11, 20). Der Anbruch der Gottesherrschaft und das Kommen seines Verheissenen gehoeren ja untrennbar zusammen. . . . Seine Worte werden zu einer klaren Antwort . . . dass in ihm Gottes Herrschaft bereits gegenwaertig ist." Rengstorff therefore translates the passage: "Die Herrschaft Gottes ist mitten unter euch."
29. *An Outline of Biblical Theology*. Philadelphia, 1946, p. 189: "Luke 17, 21 may have any one of three meanings: 1. It may refer to the rule of God in the individual's heart and life. But the context in which Luke presents it is distinctly eschatological, and the phrase translated 'within you' may well mean 'in your midst.' The saying may therefore mean 2. that the coming of the kingdom will be unpredictable and sudden but unmistakable when it occurs: to paraphrase, 'Even while you are looking about for signs of its approach, all of a sudden here it is in your midst, like a flash of lightning filling the whole sky.' The meaning may, however, be 3. the same as that of Mt. 12, 28: 'you are looking about for signs, but the kingdom is already here — in the midst of you.' The context favors the second of these interpretations."
30. *The Four Gospels*. London, 1936, p. 290: "The Kingdom of God cometh not with observation . . . the Kingdom of God is within you."
31. *The Gospel according to St. Luke*. London, 1930, *ad loc.*: "The obvious translation of the phrase ἐντὸς ὑμῶν is 'within you,' 'in your hearts.'"
32. *Op. cit.*, pp. 6—8: "Das Reich Gottes kommt nicht unter zuwartender Beobachtung, das Reich Gottes ist inwendig in euch, d. h. es handelt sich bei der Gottesherrschaft um dies ganz persoehnliche Verhaeltnis des Menschen zu Gott, ein Verhaeltnis, das den ganzen Menschen fordert."
33. See note 16.
34. *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemaeerzeit*. 4 Baende. Leipzig und Berlin, 1906—1934.
35. The same explanation is offered by T. W. Manson in his *The Mission and Message of Jesus*, pp. 595—97: "The meaning 'in the midst of' rather than 'within' is possible because the same ambiguity is found in the corresponding Hebrew and Aramaic words in the Greek ἐντός, and is demanded because the saying is addressed to Pharisees who do not believe."
36. The famous passage from Origen, as quoted by Frick, *op. cit.*, p. 101, reads: κἂν ζητῇς δὲ τό· "αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν," δύνασαι λέγειν, ὅτι "αὐτῶν" ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστός, καθὼ αὐτοβασιλεία ἐστὶ, βασιλεύων καθ' ἐκάστην ἐπινόειαν αὐτοῦ τοῦ μηκέτι βασιλευμένου ὑπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας.
37. *Adv. Marcionem*, Bk. IV, cap. 35, *Opera* (Oehler ed.), II, p. 254. The passage is quoted also by Roberts, *op. cit.*, p. 7.
38. Roberts, *op. cit.*, p. 7.
39. *Ibid.*, p. 7.
40. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke* (ICC). New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1896, *ad loc.*
41. *NUNTIUS Sodalitii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis*. No. 2 (1949) and No. 4 (1950).

St. Louis, Mo.

The Apostolic Psha!

By MARTIN H. FRANZMANN

Memory plays us scurvy tricks. I remember that Hilaire Belloc says somewhere that there are three things that a real man must be capable of saying. I remember also that the first one is: *Credo in unum Deum, Patrem omnipotentem*; and that the third one is: *Psha!* What the second one is, I have completely forgotten, a fact more irritating to my vanity than hurtful to the purpose of this study. For the line that runs from the first to the third, from the *Credo* to the *Psha!* is not so devious as it might at first glance appear to be. With the first we commit ourselves—totally, body and soul, heart, will, brain, and all—to the Almighty Father, the God of whom our Confessions speak in measured solemnity as *immensa potentia, sapientia, bonitate*. Now, if we are His, as we confess ourselves to be by His grace, the *Psha!* must inevitably follow: if we are His, there will be things that we shall have no time for; there will be attitudes and actions that we cannot stoop to; there will be a point at which a God-given impatience sets in, where we shall have to utter an Apostolic *Psha!* and proceed to more important matters.

There is no better example of this high and Apostolic impatience, this God-given *Psha!* than the words of St. Peter in the second chapter of Acts: "These men are not drunken, as ye suppose, seeing it is but the third hour of the day." St. Peter was too divinely busy, too Spirit-filled to launch into a heated and labored defense against such pasquinades as "These men are full of new wine." He rated such words at what they are worth, as the hysterical giggle with which men seek to hold firm their grasp on flat and mundane modes of existence when they are confronted with the miraculously Divine, as a frantic and scurrilous attempt to flee from the terribly numinous Presence. (King Agrippa once similarly tried to joke his way back to the daylight of his accustomed frivolity when the shadow of his fathers' God fell upon him in the words of St. Paul.) St. Peter was content to let one fact speak, not without some irony: "None but very hard and resolute drinkers," he says, "could be that drunk so early;—after all, it is only nine o'clock in the morning." And he turned him forthwith to that which was spoken by the Prophet Joel.

We have, it seems, become more thin-skinned than Our Lord's Apostles were. It is time to remind ourselves that we must muster up the courage for a devout *Psha!* upon occasion. We must not be too

diligent about erasing every scrawl that appears on the wall ecclesiastical. We need not rise with anguished yelp and energy-consuming indignation at every mangy screed, for instance, that defames Luther or the Lutherans. The time is short; there is not always time for the hard-breathing and heavy-handed rebuttal, with footnotes. A sentence or two, a brace of facts—and let the rest be silence. Our Lord was silent, dreadfully silent, sometimes too, and there were questions that He would not answer. And we shall do well to remember that *He* is building His Church, on a rock, and of such stuff that it shall prevail against graver thrusts than any that these small, unsavory assailants can deliver. The Church is an anvil that has worn out many hammers, and we ought not expend too much energy on puny smithikins that with contemptible hammerlets pelt its brazen solidity. No Church, not even one with a most amply-staffed department of public relations, has time for spiritual calisthenics; we have real battles to fight and satanically ineluctable struggles to engage in each day. These little slingers and darters are part of His Majesty the Devil's forces, no doubt; but they can succeed only by creating a diversion, in the military sense. Where they are ignored, they fail.

There is some of this same energetic impatience, this noble disdain in St. Paul too. The same stinging and refreshing salt spray is in the air that blows from his pages: "Neither give heed to fables and endless genealogies, which minister questions rather than godly edifying." St. Paul rose to do battle when the need to do battle arose, and he wrestled in agony and travail for the truth of God; but there were theologies that he did not deem worthy of an *Auseinandersetzung*; there were "problems" that he had not the time to discuss, simply because they did not lead to "godly edifying." If the practitioners of such theologies and the excogitators of such problems turned aside to "vain jangling," that was bad enough; he would not abet, or have Timothy abet, their aberrancy by "jangling" with them. One wonders, incidentally, how much patience St. Paul would have with our "periodical" type of theologian—the kind that reads all the periodicals regularly and some of Scriptures periodically. "Refuse profane and old wives' fables, and exercise thyself unto godliness." Not woman's myths, but man's work is the business of the man of God, of the theologian. I am reminded of Stauffer's annihilating criticism of Bultmann in the *Deutsches Pfarrerblatt* of October 1, 1949—reminded not only by the word "myth" but also by the whole tone of that criticism, itself a good example of the Apostolic *Psha!*, and by the emphasis on *work*. Stauffer draws up his artillery, fifteen

batteries of it, and with some Staufferian pyrotechnics, but without frivolity, trains all his guns on the hapless Bultmann, prepared, apparently, to demolish him on all counts: "Nun kann das Schieszen beginnen. . . . Aber wir beginnen nicht. Denn wir haben unsere Freude nicht am Schieszen, sondern am Arbeiten." There is the heart of Apostolic impatience, for the theologian: there is so much work to do, so much real, glorious work for us to labor at that the endless discussion of postulates and prolegomena seems by comparison a fussy sort of idleness. We turn in weariness from all the bright new books, and the glory seems gone from our vocation; theology seems almost a burden. We wish that we could dig with our hands, or shear sheep, or chop wood, thank God for each simple day as it passes, and sleep at night. But then we turn from books to the Book, from concepts and thoughts and ideas to the reality of God at work for us; we become as little children again, and the kingdom of God, the grace and mercy of God, the love of God, the righteousness of God, the peace of God, loom large before our eyes once more; the mists dissolve, and the everlasting and unshaken hills of our help appear once more. The drums of God roll, His trumpets call from golden throats, His cavalcade is on the way, the hooves of His horses strike fire on the world's rough ways, His angels hasten and cry out, "Make way! Make way!" We see it, we feel it; no, by some miracle, by some incomprehensible condescension of the King, we are in it. We ride. Caparisoned as no rider ever was, with sword and buckler, with helmet and plume, and with all the panoply of God, we ride. And as we ride, we pass a little lens-grinder's shop; and this lens-grinder is a very cunning man; he can give us a pair of spectacles that will enable us to stand by and see God's cavalcade "in an entirely new perspective." But a *Psha!* to you, Master Theological Lens-grinder; we have no time to stand and watch the cavalcade—we are in it. And a *Psha!* upon your "new perspective" too. For God's perspective is His own, and He gives it to His own without spectacles. For God moves, and only those who are moved by Him and move with Him can see Him as He would and must be seen, in His eternal and ever-new perspective. And what a sight it is from where we move with Him: we see all the sin-wrenched and sin-smirched fragments of our world brought back, renewed, restored in Christ by God's sure and almighty hand; we see the broken fractions of the world that we destroyed gathered up and made a perfect sum once more in Christ, the Denominator who in God's tremendous mathematics gives a place and a value to all things. But there is more, and though we can give but a cold and stammered account of it, our eyes catch a glimpse of it, and our ears

catch an echo of it, as amid the fearful lightnings of God's judgment and the gladsome crashing of His grace the new world rises up before our eyes, the new heavens and the new earth, where God's angels and God's redeemed thunder forth unending Alleluias and all God's little birds enter into the glorious liberty of the sons of God and sing in Paradisal freedom once more.

From such heights we must come down; but we come down with glory upon us, and we cannot but say *Psba!* to many things. So, by way of example, a *Psba!* to thin-blooded and rheumy-eyed philosophy; and a *Psba!* to prestige in all its forms—we count it dung; a *Psba!* to great men who say nice things about the Bible, deeming it a great source of ethical inspiration, valuable for the maintenance of good government and a free society, and a fine thing all around; a *Psba!* to all publicity that makes the Church look like a huckster selling a competitive product, like soap; a *Psba!* to theological gobbledegook that sicklies o'er the Good News with the pale cast of thought; and a stout Isaianic *Psba!* to all idols, including all our own twentieth-century varieties, the respectable ones.

St. Louis, Mo.

God's Concurrence in Human Action

By JOHN THEODORE MUELLER

IN presenting the doctrine of divine providence, the teachers of the Christian Church usually stress, in the first place, God's actual conservation of all created things, by which His creatures persist both in their being and their operation (*in esse suo ac vi operandi*). Should their categories at times appear as rather scholastic or academic, it is well to remember that they were endeavoring to clarify and preserve intact in its purity the somewhat mysterious Scripture doctrine of God's actual participation in creatural action against the two fundamental fallacies of erring human reason: fatalism and atheism.

GOD'S CONCURRENCE IN EVIL ACTION

Groping human reason, in scrutinizing God's co-operation in human action, either makes Him the direct and responsible cause of all action, both evil and good, or, realizing that evil and good are antitheses, or mutually exclusive concepts, it precludes Him from every action that is evil. There are of course modifications of each of these two diametrically opposed views, but beyond these general categories human reason, in its limitation of time and space and blinded by sinful prejudice, cannot go; the non-Christian philosopher is bound to be either a Stoic or an Epicurean, a determinist or a casualist, a pantheist or a materialist. According to unenlightened human speculation, either God is the cause of evil, or evil is non-existent or, at any rate, merely a matter of chance, with which God has nothing to do. Of the two speculative theories, fatalism at St. Paul's time was sponsored chiefly by what might be called the philosophical intelligentsia of paganism, while materialistic atheism as a philosophy of superficial ratiocination was espoused in the main by the masses that used it largely for the destruction of their moral self, or the suppression of the voice of conscience, as they addicted themselves to the carnal pleasures of sex, gluttony, and drunkenness. They argued: Since there is no Divine Being and all is chance,

sensual enjoyment as an end of life is fully justified. Fatalism, on the other hand, while maintaining the certainty of divine operation, denied the freedom of human self-determination and so substituted for providence an inexorable fate against which there was neither cure nor comfort for man in his distress of life and death. Both systems of thought were as hopeless as they were godless.

To St. Paul, fatalism appeared in its most common and popular development as Zenoism, or Stoicism. Philosophers like Cicero and Seneca saw in the impelling power of divine fate the redeeming virtue of sane and clean living, in which they recognized the only salvation of the decadent, perishing Roman empire. The masses and mercenary sophists, on the other hand, favored Epicurianism, which held out to them the enjoyment of the sensual with utter oblivion of the moral. In view of the atheistic principle of Epicurean thought that matter, and so man, utterly perishes in death, the Apostle, in his great treatise on the resurrection of the flesh, attributes to Epicurean hedonism a certain justification: "If after the manner of men I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me if the dead rise not? Let us eat and drink; for tomorrow we die." (1 Cor. 15:32.) However, in view of the certainty of the resurrection, and that of course means of God's remunerative and punitive providence and man's moral responsibility, St. Paul rules out the philosophy of atheistic materialism and demands the separateness of all Christians from unbelieving casualists: "Be not deceived; evil communications corrupt good manners. Awake to righteousness, and sin not; for some have not the knowledge of God. I speak this to your shame." (1 Cor. 15:32-33.)

Today the deterministic pantheist with his fatalistic deductions is still with us, though atheistic materialism, in a more or less gross form, is the popular philosophy of the majority of modern pagan men. Deistic mechanism, which separates the world from God and makes it function according to certain laws of necessity, is atheistic in its final deductions though theoretically it asserts God's existence and creation. So also the doctrine of casualism is fundamentally atheistic, for while casualists indeed recognize God's existence in theory, they, by attributing human events to non-divine causes, exchange divine providence for chance and so in reality deny God. In the view of some, providence pertains only to the great world

events, and not to the trivial occurrences in life, and so they teach what might be called the atheism of man's ordinary life. Occasionalism, which recognizes only a divine occasion that starts off creatural activity, must likewise be classified as fundamentally atheistic. Thus the world in its speculative thinking on the interrelation between divine operation and creatural activity has not advanced one iota beyond the philosophy that confronted the great Apostle, as he made known to the cynically Stoical and the equally cynically atheistic world of his day the Christian *kerygma* of God's intervention in human affairs, especially through the redemptive work of His Son Jesus Christ, our Lord. With his supernatural Gospel message of salvation, which presupposes divine providence, St. Paul therefore is still the teacher and guide of the Christian Church as it opposes pagan fatalism and pagan atheism alike by the threefold doctrine of divine conservation, divine concurrence, and divine government, which form the three parts of divine providence as taught in Christian dogmatics.

St. Paul did not teach the doctrine of divine providence in its later systematic form, but from a very practical, homiletic point of view, in order that he might preach salvation to a generation for whom salvation had no spiritual meaning. His common theme was: God, the Creator, the Preserver, the Savior, the Judge of man. To the Athenian philosophers that was a rather startling message. St. Luke graphically depicts the encounter of the great Apostle with the philosophers of Athens. St. Paul had come to "the most distinguished city in Greece, the seat of literature, philosophy, and the fine arts," after he had completed a most successful mission in Macedonia. But persecution by the Jews moved the brethren to send him away "to go, as it were, to the sea" (Acts 17:14). Silas and Timothy, the Apostle's helpers, "abode there still," to finish the work which had been begun so gloriously. At Athens St. Paul decided to await the arrival of the brethren before starting on his Gospel mission. But "his spirit was stirred in him when he saw the city wholly given to idolatry" (v. 16), and so he began to witness Christ both in the synagog and in the market daily "with them that met him." In this way the Apostle met the philosophers. "Then certain philosophers of the Epicureans and of the Stoics encountered him. And some said, What will this babler say? Other some, He

seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods; because he preached unto them Jesus and the resurrection. And they took him and brought him unto Areopagus, saying: May we know what the new doctrine, whereof thou speakest, is? For thou bringest certain strange things to our ears; we would know therefore what these things mean." (Vv. 17-20.) It is interesting here to observe St. Luke's explanatory note: "For all the Athenians and strangers which were there, spent their time in nothing else but either to tell or to hear some new thing" (v. 21).

Such, then, was the challenge which came to St. Paul as he stood on the Athenian Mars Hill, a rocky height in Athens, opposite the western end of the Acropolis, where the highest Athenian court was held and where, in addition, philosophers of all sorts, with all the privileges of an ancient "Hyde Park," expounded their various speculative theories, in which, however, there seems to have been little that was new until St. Paul came with his revealed *kerygma*. Of all the sermons of St. Paul recorded by St. Luke, the one delivered in Athens is by far the most intriguing from the viewpoint of the Christian apologist defending divine providence. Just how much of the discourse St. Luke reports, or how completely he gives the outline of the address, we do not know. Evidently the narrator quotes only the salient thoughts of the Christian *kerygma* here proclaimed. No doubt, St. Paul said much more on repentance and faith than is recorded in Acts, for though he was rudely dismissed when he began to discuss his doctrine of the final Resurrection and Judgment, there is reason to assume that he had given the Athenian philosophers, who were used to long philosophical disquisitions, a pretty good insight into the Christian message of Law and Gospel, sin and grace, repentance and remission of sins, for after all his testimony at Athens was not in vain. "Certain men clave to him and believed; among the which was Dionysius, the Areopagite, and a woman named Damaris, and others with them" (v. 34). But what interests us here, in particular, are the three elements of the doctrine of divine providence: *conservatio*, *concursus*, *gubernatio*, which St. Paul unfolded before his critical, cynical audience of pagan philosophers, who represented the philosophies both of fatalism and atheism.

As we analyze the Apostle's discourse, we find that the three

elements of divine providence stand out in clear relief. He appears in Athens with a definite message of God, who in the creation of the world and all things therein has revealed Himself as the Lord of heaven and earth. This personal God, the Creator of all men, who to the Apostle was no *Deus ignotus*, is also the Preserver of the created universe. "He giveth to all life and breath and all things" (v. 25). This personal God, moreover, concurs in all actions of men, good and evil, for "in Him we live and move and have our being" (v. 28). Finally this personal God also rules and governs all things, even the evil, for "the times of this ignorance [of pagan idolatry] God winked at, but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent" (v. 30). Pagan idolatry therefore did not take place without God's knowledge or dispensation, but by His permission; for when St. Paul argues that God "winked at [ὑπεριδών, overlooked] the times of this ignorance," he means no more and no less than what he otherwise describes as "God gave them up to" (παρέδωκεν, Rom. 1:24, 26). He thus recognizes God's permissive providence in His dealing with men of wicked disposition and evil action, by which, in His punitive judgment, He suffers them to commit the vilest abominations as a punishment for their sins (cf. *New Testament with Notes*, sub Rom. 1:24, p. 390).

The Apostle, in presenting the doctrine, does not employ the scholastic terms which Christian dogmaticians here use with such telling effect, but he nevertheless teaches every essential point of the Christian doctrine of divine providence. God certainly permits evil to take place, but He is not the Author or Abettor of the evil which He permits in His righteous judgment upon the ungodly. "For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men who hold the truth in unrighteousness" (lit., "who suppress the truth by means of unrighteousness," Rom. 1:18). Nor does God exculpate the sinners on the ground that they did not know Him and His will. At Corinth, with all the malicious wickedness of the perverse pagan world in view, St. Paul writes to the Romans: "Because that which may be known of God [lit., "the knowable things of God"] is manifest in them; for God hath showed it unto them . . . so that they are without excuse" (vv. 19-20). The heathen indeed committed idolatry, but that was not God's fault, but their own: "Professing themselves

to be wise, they became fools" (v. 22). Such is the Apostle's severe condemnation of perverse man on account of his willful wickedness. By an act of His *iustitia punitiva* the holy and righteous God suffers the wicked to sin; but when He so concurs in evil action, He is responsible only for the act as such and not for the act in so far as it is evil; in other words, God works only the effect, not the defect; or, to put it in the terminology of our dogmaticians, in so far as it is a part of His sustaining providence (*quoad materiale*), and not in so far as it is a part of wicked man's transgression (*quoad formale*). St. Paul, as said before, does not use these technical terms, but he provides the guidelines for these rather nice distinctions. God certainly permits the evil to take place, but He forbids and punishes it: "Tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil, of the Jews first and also of the Gentile" (Rom. 2:9). The divine principle that obtains, reads: "Who will render to every man according to his deeds" (Rom. 2:6).

St. Paul, however, teaches not only that God forbids and punishes evil, but also that in His overruling providence He causes the evil to redound to the good of His elect: "All things work together for good to them that love God" (Rom. 8:28). This comforting truth the Apostle applies very strikingly with respect to his own sufferings, especially in his Second Letter to the Corinthians: "As the sufferings of Christ abound in us, so our consolation also aboundeth by Christ. And whether we be afflicted, it is for your consolation and salvation, which is effectual in the enduring of the same sufferings which we also suffer" (2 Cor. 1:5-6).

St. Paul asserted the doctrine of divine providence, in particular, of God's permissive and dispensing providence, with great clarity and force also in his discourse at Lystra, where he had healed a lame man and where, in consequence, the pagan priests, regarding Barnabas as Jupiter and his more eloquent companion as Mercury, desired to do them divine homage. In deprecating this gross idolatry, St. Paul earnestly affirms God's permissive providence: "Who in times past suffered all nations to walk in their own ways" (Acts 14:16); and His preserving, dispensing, or governing providence: "He left not Himself without witness in that He did good and gave us rain from heaven and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness" (v. 17). In other words, the divine

Creator is also the divine Preserver, to whose grace and power men owe everything that is good, no matter whether they are saints or sinners. God's governmental providence here is even more clearly expressed than in the Apostle's Mars Hill address: "And hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth and hath determined the times before appointed and the bounds of their habitation" (Acts 17:26). Thus the doctrine of God's providential ruling appears as a weighty Pauline teaching.

One wonders whether St. Paul, when proclaiming to the heathen the doctrine of divine providence in its threefold aspect, was understood. At Lystra St. Paul with Barnabas "scarce restrained the people with these sayings that they had not done sacrifice unto them" (Acts 14:18); nevertheless the Apostle's discourses at Lystra and Athens seemed to have appealed to the heathen hearers as being divinely true on the basis of the divine Law inscribed in man's heart at Creation.

Dr. Augustus Strong, in his *Systematic Theology* (Vol. I, p. 419 ff.), quotes the philosophers of that era both as negating and asserting divine providence. Cicero thus says that while the gods care for the big things, they ignore the little matters. He cites also Plutarch (d. ca. A. D. 120) as asserting that divine providence could not create an infinity of worlds, since it could not take care of so many (I, p. 429). These are expressions of pagan providential faith mingled with skepticism. But in *De Natura Deorum* (11, 30) Cicero argues (through Balbus, the speaker) that the gods exist and that if this is conceded, it must be acknowledged that through their council the world is governed. Epictetus (Sec. 41) lays down the rule that the chief and most important duty in religion is to possess one's mind with just and becoming notions of the gods, to believe that such supreme beings exist, and that they govern and dispose of all the affairs of the world with a just providence. In a similar manner Marcus Antoninus remarks: "But gods there are, and they have a regard for human affairs" (I, p. 425). Of such expressions there are very many in both the Greek and the Roman writings. Concerning these the reader will find a large number also in the Luthardt-Jelke *Kompendium der Dogmatik* (15th ed., (p. 212 f.). Cicero there is quoted as saying (*De Nat. Deor.* I,

20, 52) that divine providence occupies itself especially with supplying what is most needed to uphold the world, with never letting it suffer want, and with adorning it with the most exquisite beauty. But Cicero also recognizes fate side by side with divine providence, and he regards it as unworthy of the gods to be concerned about life's trivialities (cf. *De Nat. Deor.* 1, c. II, 66, 167; c. III, 35, 86). St. Paul, therefore, when expounding to his pagan audiences the facts of divine providence, could expect them to understand at least the fundamentals of the doctrine and to receive sympathetically what he said in addition to their meager knowledge on this point.

It is certain, however, that the pagan thinkers did not derive from the doctrine of divine providence the sweet, consoling comfort which Paul consistently derived from the revealed doctrine in his private and official suffering. The Apostle's blessed ministry was, as every Bible student knows, one of extraordinary suffering, as God Himself had predicted this when He called him into the Apostolic office: "He is a chosen vessel unto Me to bear My name before the Gentiles and kings and the children of Israel, for I will show him how great things he must suffer for My name's sake" (Acts 9: 15-16). This prophecy was fulfilled to the letter. The Church of the Gentiles was built by the toil, sweat, and tears of the great Apostle. His descriptions of his sufferings culminate in two passages, one in 1 Cor. 4:9-13, and the other in 2 Corinthians 11 and 12. The first is relatively brief, but the compactness and comprehensiveness of descriptive detail renders this passage most impressive, especially the climax: "We are made as the filth of the world and are the offscouring of all things unto this day" (1 Cor. 4:13). In the second and very long description of the Apostle's continued affliction there is stress also on the inwardness of his suffering, his agony of soul, which moves him to ask God thrice to remove the buffeting messenger of Satan, the thorn in the flesh. But here is mentioned also his acquiescence in God's dispensing providence when divine love assured him that His strength is made perfect in His servant's weakness (2 Cor. 12:9). A remarkable passage indeed, and one that is unique in extant literature, for while Epicurean writings at times voice the dreadful despair of a soul afflicted beyond endurance, and Stoic literature hurls challenges of defiance to the fate that afflicts the human soul so grievously, there

is comfort only in St. Paul's description of his suffering. Epicureans and Stoics know only of one way out — self-extinction! The great Apostle sees in his unspeakable suffering a service of Christ, which ultimately redounds to God's glory and the good of His Church: "Most gladly therefore will I rather glory in my infirmities that the power of Christ may rest upon me . . . for when I am weak, then I am strong" (2 Cor. 12:9-10).

In the same way, the Apostle used the important truth of divine providence, in particular of divine concurrence in the evil actions of creatures, to the comfort of his readers: "God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able, but will with the temptation also make a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear it" (1 Cor. 10:13). But the most consoling passage regarding the cross of Christian believers is the one with which he closes his famous eighth chapter of Romans, where he triumphantly states that in all tribulation, distress, persecution, famine, nakedness, peril, sword, or whatever evil there may be, they are more than conquerors through Christ and that "neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus, our Lord" (Rom. 8:35-39). Because of the great disciplinary value of the cross, imposed upon God's children by divine love, he urges Timothy not to be ashamed of the testimony of our Lord, nor of him as His prisoner, but to be a partaker of the afflictions of the Gospel according to the power of God (2 Tim. 1:8); for, he adds: "If we suffer, we shall also reign with Him" (2 Tim. 2:12). We cannot exhaust this important subject in our article. But we must mention a few more salient points of the Apostle's gladdening teaching concerning divine providence which preserves, concurs in, and governs the evil which by the heavenly Father's gracious dispensation comes to His saints on earth, in order that He might glorify His name through them. St. Paul writes: "All things are for your sakes, that the abundant grace might through the thanksgiving of many redound to the glory of God. For which cause we faint not, but though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day. For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a

far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory, while we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen; for the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal." (2 Cor. 5:15 ff.) Divine words indeed! While the Epicurean despaired in his tribulation and the Stoic defied the deity that plagued him, St. Paul blessed the gracious hand that chastised him in love; for in his suffering, great though it was, he beheld the upholding, guiding, glorifying providence of the merciful God who in Christ Jesus was leading him *per aspera ad astra*.

Just because St. Paul believed in the beneficent purposes of divine providence, he was given to constant, devout, triumphant prayer. The Stoic could not pray, and the Epicurean would not pray, but for St. Paul prayer was a *causa sine qua non* of Christian living. He prayed always with thanksgiving to God for His manifold blessings; so also he urged his readers to "pray without ceasing" (1 Thess. 5:17). How divinely triumphant was St. Paul's prayer life! "I thank my God upon every remembrance of you, always in every prayer of mine for you all making request with joy" (Phil. 1:3-4). So he addresses the believers at Philippi. To the Christians at Ephesus he writes: "Praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit and watching thereunto with all perseverance and supplication for all saints" (Eph. 6:18). He beseeches the Thessalonians: "Brethren, pray for us" (1 Thess. 5:25). Absolutely certain that God's providential care would overrule all things for good, he asks his fellow believers to give "thanks always for all things unto God and the Father, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ" (Eph. 5:20).

St. Paul's life thus was wondrously joyous, despite its severe afflictions, and also strangely happy. He always found something for which to praise God: for the faith of the Christians at Rome, which was voiced throughout the world (Rom. 1:8); for the abundant divine grace given to the Corinthians (1 Cor. 1:4); for the constant victory that was given him in Christ (2 Cor. 2:14); for the unceasing strength which he received from the Lord (1 Tim. 1:12); even for the infirmities which he endured in Christ (2 Cor. 12:9). St. Paul's prayer and thanksgiving life proves that in him the power of Christ was mighty to conquer

all adversities and that His Word was not taught of man's wisdom, but given to him by the Holy Ghost (1 Cor. 2:13). Neither for his message nor for his holy, grateful, consecrated life is there any parallel in pagan literature or history.

GOD'S CONCURRENCE IN GOOD ACTION

This article would not be complete, would it not contain at least a brief note on God's concurrence in the good actions of men. St. Paul's teaching on divine concurrence in the evil actions of creatures is, as we saw, full of comfort for the Christian believer, since all evil actions must work together for good to those who put their trust in the Lord. But much more comforting still is the Apostle's teaching on God's concurrence in the good actions of men.

The subject demands that first of all the good actions of men be considered which are done by persons in His Kingdom of Power, or in human society in general, including pagan human society which does not have the revealed, or Biblical, religion for its source or guide. It is St. Paul's teaching that not a single good work is performed by mankind without divine instigation and operation. If, according to his teaching, all men live and move and have their being in God (Acts 17:28), then also their good works have their source in divine concurrence. For our right evaluation of the works of unconverted men and for our effective proclamation of the Christian *kerygma* to non-Christians, at home and abroad, this teaching certainly is of the greatest importance. While the so-called "externally" good works of the unregenerate cannot save them, as works save no one, neither in the Christian Church nor without, we must recognize God's preserving, co-operating, and ruling providence also in the good works done by men in His *regno potentiae* and in this area call them good. We must therefore speak of a *iustitia civilis* of non-Christians, or of good works *in externis*, such as parental love, patriotism, kindness, neighborliness, and the like. From the viewpoint of Christ's *regnum gratiae* such works of course are not good, for St. Augustine's dictum that even the best works of the heathen are but glittering vices is certainly true. The good works of the heathen are not spiritually good, that is to say, they do not flow from true love of God, since

they do not have their origin in faith in Christ, but they are good inasmuch as the Lord works them to His glory.

The doctrine that God is operative also in the non-Christian world through the Law inscribed in the human heart, permitting evil and working good, as His divine providence governs all things to His glory and the good of His elect, comforts us in our modern welter of confusion and seeming lawlessness, even as it comforted St. Paul in his own troubled time. We cannot always see the ruling and overruling divine hand which directs all things to His glory and the good of His Church, but we should always be sure of His gracious designs and of His own good and firm guidance of all mundane affairs. When St. Paul made the solemn plea before Festus: "I appeal to Caesar," and Festus, having conferred with the council, replied: "Hast thou appealed unto Caesar? Unto Caesar shalt thou go" (Acts 25:11-12), there was most assuredly in this decision of the Roman court the preserving, concurring overruling divine providence, which so directed the Apostle's future life that he converted souls that he otherwise, according to our human view, would not have converted and that he composed letters which, humanly speaking, he would not have written otherwise. From this viewpoint we must judge also St. Paul's other imprisonments. The ardent Apostle of the Gentiles was eager to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles everywhere; instead, he was led to spend considerable time of his life in seclusion and captivity. He could not see God's purpose in this enforced inactivity then; but we can, at least in part, see it today as we look back upon his blessed life and successful work. So also we shall behold in heaven the perfect picture of our own life and work which now often seems so obscure to us, and even bizarre and wrong, as "God moves in mysterious ways His wonders to perform." When Felix, to please the Jews, had left St. Paul in prison (Acts 24:27), the Lord appeared to him and said: "Be of good cheer, Paul; for as thou hast testified of Me in Jerusalem, so must thou bear witness also at Rome" (Acts 23:11). Now God directed the heart of Festus in such a way that the divine purposes were fulfilled. There is therefore law and order in the apparent *tohu vabohu* of our present-day world situation as also in the perplexities and disorders of our own lives. Only, as we do not yet walk by sight, we must

walk by faith and in the strength of the Holy Spirit hold to God's gracious promises concerning His just and merciful providence.

There is little need for us to dwell at greater length on the work of divine providence in Christ's Kingdom of Grace, as this subject has been treated so often and thoroughly. But a few notes may be appended on this certainly most weighty matter. While in His *regno potentiae* God works good works through His divine Law implanted in the human heart, the Law serving as a curb, mirror, and rule, Christ's *regnum gratiae* is properly the sphere where the Lord works His wonders of goodness and love through the Gospel, as His power unto salvation (Rom. 1:16). Those who study St. Paul's Letters without prejudice cannot fail to see how consistently and forcibly the Apostle ascribes every good thought, desire, word, and deed in the Church to the divinely revealed Gospel as God's ordained means of grace by which He preserves and governs His saints. Faith cometh by hearing the Word of God (Rom. 10:17), and the Word of God here means the "Gospel of peace," the "glad tidings of good things" (v. 15). When St. Paul pleads with believers to present their bodies a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable unto God, he does so by an appeal to the "mercies of God," that is, to the Gospel *kerygma* (Rom. 12:1). In all his Letters St. Paul magnifies Christ, and in particular the Christ in the Gospel, as the sole Source and Agent of all that is good, and that is why, too, he recognizes no other *kerygma* than "Jesus Christ, and Him Crucified" (1 Cor. 2:2). To him Christ is everything: "Wisdom, and Righteousness, and Sanctification, and Redemption" (1 Cor. 1:30). By the risen, living, ruling Christ, the Apostle appeals to the Corinthians to be steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, assured that their labor is not in vain in the Lord (1 Cor. 15:58). All glory be to Christ; all efficacy, to His powerful Gospel. Such was St. Paul's guiding principle in his heroic ministry. His entire Apostolic mission was centered in Christ and His blessed Gospel. Through the Gospel he begat the Corinthian believers to be children of God and heirs of eternal life (1 Cor. 4:15). All things he does for the Gospel's sake that he may become a partaker thereof with those whom he gains by its proclamation (1 Cor. 9:23). So great is his reverence for the Gospel that he, in the name of the Lord, anathematizes all who

preach any other Gospel (Gal. 1:8). For the Gospel's sake he does not regret his bonds in Christ, but thanks God that the things which happened fell out unto the furtherance of the divine *kerygma* (Phil. 1:12). By the Gospel of Christ, which he proclaimed, God's elect in Thessalonica were called "to the obtaining of the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ" (2 Thess. 2:13-14). These are but a few passages showing how greatly St. Paul glorified the Gospel as the divinely ordained means by which the Holy Ghost calls, converts, sanctifies, and keeps in faith unto everlasting life God's elect saints. All that may be said on this point is summed up in the Apostle's triumphant words: "I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth, to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith, as it is written, The just shall live by faith" (Rom. 1:16-17).

Such, then, is St. Paul's glorious doctrine of divine providence. But there is still another thought to remember: the Lord who preserves, co-operates in, and rules all things is the same Christ Jesus whom God has set "at His own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come; and hath put all things under His feet, and gave Him to be the Head over all things to the Church, which is His body, the fullness of Him that filleth all in all" (Eph. 1:20 ff.). What precious comfort there lies in this Gospel truth for us today who minister as ambassadors of Christ in the final period of the world's existence, in order that the last elect may be gathered in, thereby helping to fulfill our Lord's prophecy: "This Gospel of the Kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come."

St. Louis, Mo.

Chalcedon After Fifteen Centuries

By JAROSLAV PELIKAN

THIS year marks the fifteen hundredth anniversary of one of the most important councils of the ancient Church, the Council of Chalcedon in 451. Chalcedon is generally regarded as the conclusion of almost a century and a half of theological discussion centering in the doctrine of the person of Christ. This discussion came to a focus at the first four ecumenical councils—Nicaea in 325, Constantinople in 381, Ephesus in 431, and Chalcedon in 451. Out of these four councils and the theological work that went into them there emerged the dogmas of the Trinity and of the person of Christ which have since become the common property of ecumenical Christendom. This fact alone would make Chalcedon an important event in Christian history.

It is all the more important in view of the issues it discussed and settled. For regardless of the varying answers they may offer to it, Christians are agreed that the question of the relation of Jesus to God is central to Christian thinking and to the Christian faith. The dogma of the Trinity was the way the ancient Church sought to express its understanding of that relation, and around this theme most of its theological controversies revolved. Questions like justification and the Sacraments, which have so divided Christendom in the last five centuries, were by-passed in favor of the Trinitarian and Christological issues. So important were these questions to the ancient Church that most of its theologians felt compelled to deal with them at length.

After a millennium and a half the question is not out of place: What is the relevance of all this today? If these issues are as central as the early Christians thought they were, the Trinitarian and Christological dogmas should certainly speak to the modern Church as well. The fact that they do not, or at least that their address is considerably muffled, is due at least in part to the fact that the forms of thought and expression into which the ancient councils cast these dogmas belong to a frame of reference unfamiliar to modern Christians and oftentimes even to modern theologians. As

a result, many hold to those dogmas with dogged persistence and little understanding, while others reject them without ever having understood their basic religious intention.¹ Contemporary theology needs to discover what a recent interpreter has termed "the perennial meaning of the doctrine of the Trinity . . . the immanent actuality of the transcendent meaning of life in history and in human experience on the basis of the presupposition that God is knowable only through Jesus the Christ."²

Because of the importance of these issues to the Christian faith in any age a historical appreciation of their formulation in a particular age is always valuable. On the occasion of the fifteen hundredth anniversary of Chalcedon this essay will seek to analyze the problem that confronted the council, the settlement at which the council arrived, and the relation of that settlement to the theology that followed.³

I

Soon after the Council of Nicaea in 325 it became apparent to many observers that the solution it had discovered to the Christological problem was by no means final and that it left many important issues unresolved. For more than a century after Nicaea, theologians in various parts of Christendom grappled with those issues, and several approaches—or, as the textbooks usually term them, "schools"—evolved. At least two of these are important for the Council of Chalcedon, since the council was asked to choose between them.

The first of these, generally known as the "Antiochian school," was represented in the fifth century by one of the finest theological minds of the ancient Church, Theodore of Mopsuestia. After having been hidden by polemics for many centuries, the true character of Theodore's theological concern is only now beginning to emerge from modern historico-theological research.⁴ The predominant tone of his theological work was exegetical, this in sharp contrast to most of his contemporaries and adversaries, including the orthodox ones. On the basis of his exegetical research, Theodore came to the conclusion that much of the Christological speculation of his time was selling the humanity of Christ short and that the earthly life of our Lord did not occupy a sufficiently prominent place in that speculation. He and his pupils sought to restore the picture

of Jesus which we have in the Gospels to its proper place, lest a theological speculation that concentrated exclusively on His pre-existence rob the faith of its historical locus. This attempt was in many ways justifiable, in view of the form which that speculation was taking. Sure it is, as this journal pointed out recently, that without the concrete historical figure of Jesus of Nazareth the Christian faith is impossible.⁵ No theological speculation is valid which obscures this fact, and the Antiochian school was giving voice to a legitimate Christian concern in protesting against such speculation.

Meanwhile, the other principal "school," the Alexandrian, was attempting to maintain the full scope of the Church's faith and confession of Christ as *κύριος* and Savior, which it saw threatened by the Antiochian school.⁶ Modern research in the history of dogma, spearheaded by Adolf Harnack, has not been as kind to the Alexandrians as it has to the Antiochians, largely because of Harnacks' own anti-Trinitarian bias.⁷ Nevertheless, a study of the work of Cyril of Alexandria reveals a profoundly Christian concern at work in his opposition to the overemphasis upon the humanity of Jesus. The salvation which was wrought in Jesus Christ is the work of God, and Jesus Christ is God in person. The Jesus of the Gospels is the Christ in whom God has brought about our salvation, and no theological formulation is legitimate which obscures this unity, or *homousia*, between the Father and the Son. For without it the work of Christ loses its eternal validity and relevance. The task of the theologian, then, as Cyril understood it, was to formulate the doctrine of the person of Christ in such a way as to preserve that unity. That had, indeed, been the intention of the dogma of the two natures from the beginning, to assert that men can take hold of God personally in Christ Jesus, His Son and our Lord.

In their attempt to formulate and express the valid insights they both had, the Antiochian and Alexandrian theologians were both driven to extremes of form and content that tended to jeopardize the very point they were seeking to maintain. For by the time Theodore's follower Nestorius had completed his development, he had evolved a Christology in which the duality of natures, taught by all parties, tended to become a dualism instead. To what extent this was Nestorius' own position is still a matter of historical

debate,⁸ but there is almost common consent that, consistently carried out, the approach of the Antiochian school led to such a separation of the divine and the human in Christ as seriously to impair the unity of His person. At the opposite extreme lay the outriggers of the Alexandrian position, in which the humanity of Jesus tended to become merely a traditional slogan rather than a religious reality, and the deity so thoroughly absorbed the humanity that Eutychianism and later Monophysitism, the theory of only one nature, were a logical result. In the two decades between the Council of Ephesus and the Council of Chalcedon in 451, theological scholarship, ecclesiastical manipulation, and imperial politics combined in an attempt to force a decision.

It is noteworthy that the principal antagonists on both sides of this great debate were Eastern theologians. This was not because the West did not concern itself with the Christological and Trinitarian problems. Tertullian's essay *Ad Praxean*⁹ and Augustine's *De Trinitate*¹⁰ are still essential to an understanding of the history of those problems. But the West did not view the problematics of these dogmas in the same way as did the East. The tradition of Western thought, as represented by Tertullian, Augustine, Luther, and Calvin, has tended to regard the alternatives between Antiochian and Alexandrian Christology as poorly drawn. Though there have been exceptions, as we shall note later, this has been the traditional line of Western theology. It was the line taken by Pope Leo the Great, who combined to a rare and remarkable degree the qualities of capable theological scholarship and prudent ecclesiastical statesmanship. That combination enabled him to carry the day at Chalcedon, for in his famous *Tome* he evolved a formula on which all could agree and at the same time added prestige to the already illustrious reputation of his episcopal see.¹¹

II

The settlement of the Christological issue at which Chalcedon arrived becomes clear from a study of the pertinent section of its decrees. The text has not been transmitted to us without adulteration, and some doubt exists about critical portions of it. Nevertheless, the best available evidence seems to point to the following reading:¹²

"Following, then, the holy fathers, we all unanimously teach the confession of one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ: perfect in deity and perfect in humanity; consubstantial with the Father according to the deity and consubstantial with us according to the humanity; like us in all things except sin; begotten of the Father according to the deity before the ages, but of Mary the virgin mother of God¹³ according to the humanity in the last days for us and for our salvation; one and the same Christ, the Son, the Lord, the Only-begotten; known in two natures¹⁴ without being mixed, transmuted, divided, or separated—the distinction between the natures is by no means done away with through the union, but rather the identity¹⁵ of each nature is preserved and concurs into one person and being¹⁶—not divided or torn into two persons, but one and the same Son and Only-begotten, God the Word, the Lord Jesus Christ; just as the prophets of old and the Lord Jesus Christ Himself have taught us about Him, and as the symbol of the fathers has transmitted to us."

Viewed in terms of the controversial viewpoints we discussed earlier, this statement represents a keen insight into the problem involved and a precise delineation of the Church's answer to that problem. Many modern interpreters, for whom the issues raised at Chalcedon have lacked existential significance, have viewed the Chalcedonian settlement as a compromise between the two alternatives posed by the Antiochian and Alexandrian schools.¹⁷ It seems, however, that the statement of the council seeks to occupy a position not between those alternatives, but beyond them. Over against the Christology characterized by Theodore it defends the unity of Christ's person *εἰς ἓν πρόσωπον καὶ μίαν ὑπόστασιν*. Over against the extremes potentially present in the Alexandrian Christology it declares *σωζομένης . . . τῆς ιδιότητος ἑκατέρας φύσεως*. And it battles against both with a quartet of alpha privatives: *ἀσυγχύτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀδιαιρέτως, ἀχωρίστως*.¹⁸ This is no compromise solution, but rather an attempt to preserve both aspects of the Incarnation in opposition to viewpoints which, while legitimate in and of themselves, threatened to make a rational construct out of something that had to remain a paradox of faith. The whole structure of two *φύσεις* in one *ὑπόστασις* had come into being in order to safeguard that paradox against movements like Docetism, Sabel-

lianism, and Arianism. At Chalcedon the Church found it necessary to carry its refinement of the Christological dogma a step further because of the new antitheses that had arisen.

It is not accurate, therefore, to designate the Christological and Trinitarian dogmas as stated at various councils, including Chalcedon, as attempts to explain the faith rationally. Despite their somewhat formidable philosophical apparatus these dogmas were not intended to clear away the paradox of the faith and the "mystery of godliness." On the contrary, they were intended to make clear precisely how paradoxical and how mysterious is the Christian faith, and particularly its central event in Christ. In order to do this, they made use of the available philosophical concepts and terms of their time; and as Professor Pauck has pointed out in the essay quoted above, "the terminological difficulties of the ancient theologians should be slowly criticized by those who, in spite of the much more refined and complex philosophical and scientific instruments available in modern times, have not succeeded in interpreting the Christian God-idea as grounded in the divine revelation in Jesus in such a manner that what the ancients meant to achieve by their doctrines of the Trinity is effectively expressed for the modern Church in modern terms."¹⁹

At the same time there are discernible in the Chalcedonian settlement, as in some of the earlier conciliar decisions, marks of a Greek preoccupation with the person of Christ rather than with the work of Christ. For the New Testament neither of these two themes seems to be very far from the other; but in the course of its theological development the Church has tended to separate them.²⁰ Because the early controversies dealt with the relation of the divine and the human in Christ rather than with the significance of the Cross, the conciliar decisions were addressed to the issue of this relation, too. In the process, however, the meaning of the Cross and the nature of the Atonement did not receive particular attention from the councils, with the result that the ancient Church has given us an interpretation of the person of Christ worked out in meticulous detail, but no interpretation of the work of Christ — or, rather, so many that students of patristics are still debating about the principal Atonement metaphors of the early fathers.²¹

What Chalcedon did represent was the Church's Both-And to

a false Either-Or. Its formulation sought to state the unity of Christ's person in the interest of identifying the redemption as an act of God Himself. It sought to state the duality of natures in the interest of identifying the Redeemer with the common lot of all humanity. And it sought to say both these things simultaneously and clearly.

III

At least one question remains, the question of the adequacy of the Chalcedonian settlement. That question is a purely academic one without the perspective that the intervening centuries provide. Viewed from that perspective, the work of the Council of Chalcedon takes on proper proportion. It was a temporary settlement of the issues which its time directed to it. Specifically, it represented a temporary victory of the Western approach over the Eastern. It provides a formulation of the Christological issue that transcended both the false alternatives confronting fifth-century theology, and without it later theological development would probably not have gone as it has.

But later theological development there was. The question of the divine and human in Christ is so central to Christian thinking that no theologian has been able to avoid it. And it is indicative of the importance of Chalcedon that though its formulation may not have been detailed and precise enough to meet all the possible Christological theories that were to arise, subsequent Christological discussion could not avoid Chalcedon when it took up those theories. There are at least three episodes in the history of that discussion which illustrate the place of Chalcedon in the history of the doctrine of the person of Christ.

The most immediate of these was the Christological development of Eastern theology after 451.²² Those who were concerned with maintaining the unity of Christ's person at any price continued their insistence even after Chalcedon. Political considerations were present, too, and in 482 these brought the Emperor Zeno the Isaurian to issue his *Henotikon*, which was to serve as a rallying point for those who believed that Chalcedon threatened the unity of the person of Christ for those who feared the increasing power of the Roman See. Despite its name, the *Henotikon* ultimately produced even more splits in the Monophysite party. Under Justinian, Chal-

cedon suffered further interpretation, until the fifth ecumenical council in Constantinople in 553 rendered an official exegesis of the Chalcedonian formula in terms of the theology of Cyril. But by this time the refinements of viewpoint that had arisen had rendered Chalcedon obsolete, since it could not be expected to solve such questions as: Did the flesh of Christ become immortal at the time of the Incarnation or at the time of the Resurrection? Cast as it was in a predominantly Western mold, Chalcedon was too simple and naive a formulation for later Eastern development.

This is not to say that the West did nothing about Christology after Chalcedon. But the major Christological controversy of Western theological history did not come until more than a millennium later. This was the controversy between the Lutheran and the Reformed, presaged in Luther's soteriological Christology as stated against Zwingli. Both sides saw parallels to their opponents' viewpoint in one or another ancient heresy. The Lutherans called the Reformed "Nestorians," and the Reformed called the Lutherans "Eutychians." As a result of this polemic, Lutheran theologians devoted much research to ancient Christology and to Chalcedon, all the more because the Reformed professed to be following Chalcedon. The scope and significance of that research would be an apt subject for a separate essay,²³ but in the present context it indicates the hold that Chalcedon still had over Christian theology after a full eleven centuries had passed.

That hold is evident, at least negatively, in more recent Christological developments as well. The nineteenth century took it upon itself to replace the "Christ of faith" with the "Jesus of history." In order to do this, it directed its criticism at the doctrine of the two natures and at Chalcedon.²⁴ As we have already mentioned, this type of thinking dominated many leaders of scholarship and thought in historical theology to such an extent that most manuals in the field of *Dogmengeschichte* do not accord Chalcedon a fair evaluation, while so-called conservative scholars do not display sufficient critical insight to make their analysis plausible.²⁵ From the very vehemence with which it has been attacked and defended, the importance of Chalcedon is evident. Now that current New Testament research has demonstrated the impossibility of separating "the historical Jesus" from the "Christ of

faith," it is to be hoped that current research in the history of theology may produce insights into the origins and development of the Christological and Trinitarian dogmas that will do justice to both fact and faith.

NOTES

1. Symptomatic of that situation is the rather embarrassed way Emil Brunner deals with "Ort und Geschichte der Trinitätslehre" in his *Dogmatik*, I (Zurich, 1946), pp. 251—255.
2. Wilhelm Pauck, "The Character of Protestantism in the Light of the Idea of Revelation," *The Heritage of the Reformation* (Boston, 1950), p. 138.
3. Indispensable for an interpretation of Chalcedon are the two standard manuals on the history of dogma: Adolph Harnack, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, II (3d ed.; Leipzig, 1894), pp. 242—267; and Reinhold Seeberg, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, II (Leipzig, 1923), pp. 242—267. There is a useful translation of the most important documents in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*. Second Series, XIV (New York, 1916), pp. 243 to 295. A neat summary of the council is in B. J. Kidd, *A History of the Church to A.D. 461*, III (Oxford, 1922), pp. 311—339. Nevertheless, Harnack's complaint, *op. cit.*, p. 351, note 1, is still in order: "Trotz dieser Arbeiten besitzen wir eine kritische Darstellung der Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte fuer die entscheidenden Jahre *vor dem Chalcedonense noch nicht."
4. That research was still going on a few years ago and will probably continue; cf. R. Abramowski, "Neue Schriften Theodors von Mopsuestia," *Zeitschrift fuer die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, XXXIII (1934), pp. 66 to 84, who comments "dass wir ueber ihn . . . keine brauchbare Monographie besitzen."
5. F. E. Mayer, "Historical Relativism of Dialectical Theology and Biblical Study," *CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY*, XXI (1950), pp. 707—709.
6. Cf. P. Rohrbach, *Die alexandrinischen Patriarchen als Grossmacht in der kirchenpolitischen Entwicklung des Orients* (Berlin, 1891) for the interrelation of theology and ecclesiastical politics in Alexandria.
7. See Professor Pauck's critique of Harnack's handling of the Trinity, *op. cit.*, pp. 136—138.
8. The literature and problems of this debate can be consulted in Seeberg, *op. cit.*, pp. 210—220. It is interesting that even Luther defended him against the traditional interpretation.
9. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, III (Buffalo, 1885), pp. 597—627.
10. Of the many studies of *De Trinitate*, one of the best known to me is M. Schmaus, *Die psychologische Trinitätslehre des heiligen Augustinus* (Muenster, 1927).
11. Leo's *Tome* appears in English translation in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, *loc. cit.*, pp. 254—258.
12. A critical edition of the text, which I have followed in my translation, appears in August Hahn, *Bibliothek der Symbole und Glaubensregeln der alten Kirche* (2d ed.; Breslau, 1877), pp. 84—86. This supersedes the defective text transmitted by Evagrius and reprinted in the Catalog of Testimonies, *Concordia Triglotta* (St. Louis, 1921), p. 1108.
13. The question of whether Mary should be called *θεοτόκος* was one of the principal issues raised by Nestorius.

14. Here the best Greek manuscripts have ἐκ δύο φύσεων, while the ancient Latin text has "in duabus naturis," apparently derived from the reading ἐν δύο φύσεων. Most scholars regard this latter reading as the more probable; see the testimonies cited by Hahn, *op. cit.*, p. 84, note 347. It is interesting to note, however, that J. A. Dorner makes a noteworthy case for the genuineness of the ἐκ, *Entwicklungsgeschichte der Lehre von der Person Christi*, II (Berlin, 1853), pp. 129—130, note 41.
15. The word is ἰδιότης, meaning "identity" or "peculiar nature." It is singularly ambiguous in that Nestorius could maintain that each nature has its ἰδιότης.
16. συντρεχούσης εἰς ἓν πρόσωπον καὶ μίαν ὑπόστασιν. Is there a distinction intended here between πρόσωπον and ὑπόστασις? If so, what is it? Seeberg, *op. cit.*, p. 262, note 1, explains the construction as a pleonasm.
17. So, for example, Karl Heussi, *Kompendium der Kirchengeschichte* (10th ed.; Tuebingen, 1949), p. 142, speaks of "das dogmatisch vermittelnde Chalcedonense. . . . Die Annahme des Chalcedonense kennzeichnet daher ebenso den Mangel an Wahrheitssinn wie die Wiedererstarkung der kaiserlichen Gewalt in der oestlichen Kirche."
18. Johann Gerhard's exegesis of these terms is concise; "1. ἀσυγχύτως, without being mixed, since out of the two natures there was no third nature or essence made through a σύγχυσις; 2. ἀτρέπτως, without being transmuted, since the divine nature was not changed into the human, nor was the human changed into the divine; 3. ἀδιαιρέτως, without being divided, since after the incarnation the Λόγος cannot be divided from the flesh, nor the flesh from the Λόγος; 4. ἀχωρίστως, without being separated, since the two natures, once united, are never separated." *Loci Theologici*, ed. by E. Preuss, I (Berlin, 1863), p. 500. See also the interpretation of Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom*, II (New York, 1896), p. 65.
19. Pauck, *op. cit.*, p. 139.
20. Though one may not be willing to go all the way with him, there is much truth in Karl Barth's analysis: "Die Unterscheidung von persona und officium . . . ist nun gewiss logisch korrekt und scheinbar unvermeidlich. Ihre Anwendung auf diese persona und dieses officium ist dennoch unmöglich, sofern sie eine eigentliche und nicht eine lehrhaft-dispositionsmaessige sein sollte. . . . So . . . wird im Neuen Testament von Jesus Christus geredet, waehrend eine schematische Verteilung die Folge haben musste und gehabt hat, dass man das Geheimnis der Person Christi unterschaezte, weil man die Art und den Umfang seines Werkes nicht unmittelbar vor Augen hatte, und umgekehrt dieses nicht verstand, weil man sich nicht Rechenschaft darueber gab, dass man es als Werk dieser Person zu wuerdigen hatte." *Kirchliche Dogmatik*, III-2 (Zurich, 1948), pp. 71 to 72.
21. One attempt to resolve the problem of patristic atonement-theory is Gustaf Aulén, *Christus Victor*, tr. by A. B. Hebert (London, 1931); but the problem seems to me to be far more complex than Aulén makes it, historically as well as doctrinally.
22. On this entire development in its political context, cf. Gutav Krueger, *Die monophysitischen Streitigkeiten im Zusammenhang mit der Reichspolitik* (Jena, 1884); on the later influence of Chalcedon in the East, cf. the learned discussion of Friedrich Loofs, *Leontius von Byzanz* (Leipzig, 1887), p. 72 ff.
23. Chalcedon is referred to, for example, in Luther's "Von den Konziliis und Kirchen," *Saemmtliche Schriften* (St. Louis Edition), XVI:2233—2248;

in Johann Brenz, *Recognitio propheticae et apostolicae doctrinae de vera maiestate Domini nostri Jesu Christi* (Tuebingen, 1564), p. 18 and *passim*; Martin Chemnitz, *De duabus naturis in Christo* (1571; reprinted, Frankfurt, 1653), p. 86; Aegidius Hunnius, *Libelli III de persona Christi* (Frankfurt, 1590), pp. 259—261. Franz Pieper believes that "eine unbefangene historische Forschung wird immer zu dem Resultat gelangen, dass die lutherische Kirche in ihrer Christologie den Konsensus der alten Kirche fuer sich hat, waehrend die reformierte Kirche sich durchaus in den von der alten Kirche abgewiesenen nestorianischen Bahnen bewegt." *Christliche Dogmatik*, II (St. Louis, 1917), p. 287. Unfortunately, no such "unbefangene historische Forschung" exists, since the matter has been treated almost exclusively from a polemical angle in the books that have considered it.

24. "When at Chalcedon the West overcame the East," writes Albert Schweitzer, "its doctrine of the two natures dissolved the unity of the Person, and thereby cut off the last possibility of a return to the historical Jesus. The self-contradiction was elevated into a law. But the Manhood was so far admitted as to preserve, in appearance, the rights of history." *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, tr. by W. Montgomery (London, 1911), p. 3.
25. One of the few exceptions to this is the analysis of Gottfried Thomasius, *Die Christliche Dogmengeschichte*, I (Erlangen, 1874), pp. 346—356: "Das Symbol selbst aber steht ueber den noch uebrigbleibenden Problemen, nicht als die theologische Vermittlung derselben, wohl aber als die zusammengefasste Einheit der wesentlichen Momente des Dogmas, soweit sie sich dem kirchlichen Bewusstsein erschlossen haben, und als die scharfe Bezeichnung der Grenzlinie, welche jede weitere Entwicklung zu vermeiden habe" (p. 355).

St. Louis, Mo.

John Chrysostom on the Christian Home as a Teacher

By ARTHUR C. REPP

JOHN CHRYSOSTOM is known in the Christian Church primarily as the greatest pulpit orator of the fourth century. His excellency as a preacher, which also made him an outstanding example of the Antioch school of theology, has, in a measure, caused the Church to lose sight of his contributions to educational thought. Yet according to one authority John wrote the finest pedagogic treatise of the patristic era and developed "a method of sex instruction that is without superior in the history of education."¹ In spite of this high tribute, however, the church father has been either generally ignored by American and English historians of education or evaluated on the basis of limited information.

A study of John's voluminous writings gives us a fairly clear picture of his views on education, especially his concept of the home as an educational agency. Accordingly the underlying thought of John's philosophy was that education must be the means through which God's purpose in creating and redeeming mankind is to be attained, namely, the eternal life of serving and glorifying God. This viewpoint placed God in the center of John's philosophy of education, set up the goals, and determined the true values. Anything which deflected man from God's ultimate objective was harmful and lost whatever value it might otherwise have.

John believed that the realization of man's ultimate purpose could under the guidance of the Spirit of God come only through an education based on the one true source of knowledge, the Scriptures. While man's innate knowledge, reason, and experiences supplied important sources of truth, they were at best only supplementary to the Scriptures and had to be modified accordingly.

While John viewed man's education from various angles, intellectual, moral, domestic, social, vocational, civic, aesthetic, and even physical, he never viewed these as separate entities or divorced them from his underlying principle which permeated all of man's

actions. Because of their interrelatedness it is impossible to unravel them into several strands without in some way tearing the general skein. Any division of the intellectual and the moral, for example, is actually impossible except in an academic sense. Since the domestic was to serve both the intellectual and the moral training, this phase of education is even more interrelated. The same may be said of the social, civic, vocational, and aesthetic, which received only incidental emphases, and then only when they served his main interest.

Not only were the various phases of education interrelated according to John's philosophy, but he correctly regarded education to be a process which affected the entire man. Hence the Christian philosophy, as he conceived it, was not only true, but was the one and only integrating factor for the total man. His unifying principle was in every sense a *unifying* principle.

John recognized education to be a lifelong process. Throughout life man strove for the ultimate goal without ever achieving it. In fact, many of the elements of everyday living often caused sudden reverses. Hence man was constantly in need of the educator's guidance. While youth was the ideal time for the teacher because good habits were best formed during the tender years, youth and adulthood played equally important parts in the educator's program. Thus education was both a lifelong process and a continuous process since the soul, or the mind, tended always to be active.

The three educational agencies in which the church father was interested to implement his philosophy of education were the home, the church, and the school. Of these three, John believed the home to be by far the most important. His sermons and writings which dealt with education stressed chiefly this one agency, with the school and church merely as extensions or means to undergird the home in its task. The most significant of John's writings, *Vanity and the Education of Children*, deals exclusively with the home, giving directions to parents how a child, particularly the son of the upper classes, should be trained.² The sermons addressed to persons of all classes indicate that every home must be regarded as a *palaistra* for the training of children and adults.³

God gave the responsibility of training chiefly to the home, and

therefore it was a divine obligation which had to be met.⁴ He so arranged matters that children had parents primarily in order to be trained properly. The mere fact that a man begot children did not make him a father, nor because a woman bore a child did she thereby become a mother, but when they gave their children the proper training, then, and then only, were they worthy of that title.⁵ The neglect of the home brought the whole world into confusion and an uproar.⁶ When temporal affairs were placed first in importance and education was neglected, parents brought untold grief upon themselves.⁷ "For as untilled land, such is also youth neglected, bringing forth many thorns from many quarters."⁸ When all in the home lived up to their responsibility, they were armed against all evil.

Let thy home be a sort of arena, a place of exercise for virtue, that, having trained thyself well there, thou mayest with entire skill encounter all abroad.⁹

Education in the home was the duty chiefly of parents, and the use of pedagogs was only supplementary.¹⁰ God had taken great care for the training of children, planting in human nature "that strong love which with an irresistible power inviteth parents to provide for them."¹¹ While fathers were inclined to be concerned more with their business and their amusements and leave this task to the mothers and slaves, John admonished them: "Let everything be secondary with us to the provident care of our children," a lesson which the rich and the poor must learn.¹²

Christian mothers, it seems, were ready to accept the responsibility of their daughters, but were somewhat remiss with their sons. John was emphatic in his reminder that they had the same responsibility in the education of boys. God made no distinction between the sexes. The pains which a mother suffered in bearing children were more than recompensed by a virtuous life which followed a good training. Though the authority and responsibility lay chiefly with the fathers, mothers had a greater opportunity to educate because they were constantly at home, while the fathers had to care for their business.¹³ The mother's influence, as John envisioned it, was in marked contrast to a Greek society and morality which knew little of a mother's influence and where sons were taken from them at an early age.¹⁴

When it became necessary to choose a pedagog or a nurse, parents were in duty bound to take great care to choose such as were able to lay a good foundation.¹⁵ John lamented the fact that parents were often careless in their choice. With some bitterness he told his congregation:

If we have set a tutor [pedagog] over a child's soul, we take at once, and at random, whoever comes in our way. And yet than this art there is not another greater. For what is equal to training the soul and forming the mind of one that is young? For he that hath this art, ought to be more exactly observant than any painter and any sculptor. But we take no account of this, but look to one thing only, that he may be trained as to his tongue. And to this again we have directed our endeavors for money's sake. For not that he may be able to speak, but that he may get money, does he learn speaking; since, if it were possible to grow rich even without this, we should have no care even for this.¹⁶

When God designated parents as the chief educators of children, He gave them both the responsibilities and the rights to carry out their obligation.¹⁷ They had the authority to set up rules and see to it that they were enforced. The father who was the chief authority in the home was like a king who must govern the child.¹⁸ God required children to obey parents and respond to their wishes and admonitions.¹⁹ They owed this obedience and honor in payment for their being brought into the world.²⁰

While this authority was mixed with love, it must be stern when there were infractions. There was no purpose in setting up rules in the home if they were not enforced.²¹ Since the father's purpose was to teach the son self-discipline, he must be quick to mete out punishment and yet be loving when his rules were kept, rewarding with praise.²² It was not always necessary to inflict the rod, for there were many other ways of disciplining.²³ If, however, the parent had threatened, he must carry it out, for threats were proper only when the child believed that they would be enforced. "Punish him," John advised parents when the son was disobedient,

now with a stern look, now with incisive, now with reproachful, words; at other times win him with gentleness and promises. Have not recourse to blows constantly, and accustom him not to be trained by the rod; for if he feel it constantly as he is being

trained, he will learn to despise it. And when he has learnt to despise it, he has reduced thy system to nought. Let him rather at all times fear blows but not receive them.²⁴

Where a home was properly conducted and the children were well trained, many blessings and joys abounded.²⁵ Such children brought praise from others, increased the mutual love between parents and themselves, and enabled the children to serve their parents in old age.²⁶ Above all, God held such parents and children in high esteem and honor.²⁷

On the other hand, when parents neglected their children, they were worse than murderers, inviting the wrath of God. He held them personally responsible for their neglect and on Judgment Day would ask them pointedly why they were guilty when He had set them up as teachers, had given them the children while "still tender" when they could be molded, and had clothed them with authority and power. Parents could not hope for forgiveness when they were guilty of such neglect.²⁸

The education of girls was the special care of mothers, who were so to train them that they could leave their father's house to marriage as combatants from the *palaistra*, "furnished with all necessary knowledge."²⁹ Since older girls were generally kept away from men, this task fell naturally upon mothers and perhaps a female slave.³⁰ John said to them:

Mothers, be specially careful to regulate your daughters well; for the management of them is easy. Be watchful over them, that they may be keepers at home. Above all instruct them to be pious, modest, despisers of wealth, indifferent to ornament.³¹

Among many families of the Orient it was customary to segregate the daughters in their own quarters, bolted from intruders and restricted at all times from going out. Even relatives were forbidden to visit them lest the girls' modesty be sullied.³² John was doubtful whether this was the best way. He recalled that Rebecca went out to the well to water the flock and still remained chaste. Perhaps girls should get out at times and not always remain in their quarters. "Our young women rarely go to the market, and then always with servants, and yet they often fall."³³ This observation was somewhat in contrast to his own opinion previous to the experiences of his Antioch ministry. Then he felt that it was good

for girls to be kept close at home, for they were relieved of the temptation of being compelled "to the gaze of men."³⁴

In general the training of girls was to be the same as that of boys except that they were to be taught how to manage a home.³⁵ John stressed that they were to be protected both from a society which was ready to ensnare them and against themselves because of "the passionateness of their own human nature."³⁶ Mothers were admonished to be exemplary in every detail and to be mindful that their daughters would imitate their behavior. Hence he enjoined them: "Be a pattern to thy daughter of modesty, deck thyself with that adorning, and see that thou despise the other [external beauty]; for that is in truth an ornament, the other a disfigurement."³⁷

Education was more than keeping children alive and free from starving as the common people were accustomed to believe.³⁸ The home, as John conceived it, was responsible for the moral and domestic training and such basic knowledge which was necessary. The best way in which such training could be carried on was in a Christian environment, for thus the abstract moral concepts became meaningful.³⁹ If this were generally done, there would be no need for laws and courts.⁴⁰

John suggested that the natural experiences of a normal home should be supplemented by contrived experiences to strengthen the emotional bonds. For example, he cited with approval how affectionate parents who saw that their little children were being weaned away by friends of their own age caused "their servants to enact many fearful things, that by such fear they may be constrained to flee for refuge to their mother's bosom." By such experiences children were to learn the love and security of their parents.⁴¹ Similarly a child should be taught patience by being crossed by a member of the family or a slave "so that he may learn on every occasion to control his passion."⁴²

A correct parental attitude would make children more ready to accept the parent's standard of values and regard the acquisition of virtue far more important than the accumulation of wealth, power, and knowledge.

The proper attitude which a child should acquire must not be limited to things and to abstractions, but should extend to persons. For example, children should not be free to injure slaves. They

should deport themselves toward them as to their brothers. When a child insulted a slave, particularly the pedagog, he must be punished in the same manner as he would be if he had injured a free born.⁴³

John placed great emphasis upon the devotional life of the family to supplement the teaching in the church and to strengthen the moral and religious ties of the home. He suggested that daily prayers be conducted, especially before and after each meal. Such prayers prevented disorderly conversation, drunkenness, and gluttony.⁴⁴

On days when there was a public worship the meal should in a particular way become a devotional period. John recommended that the family sit down to a double meal, one of meat and drink and the other of spiritual food. To make the public service more effective in the daily life of the family, the father should take out his Bible and read the section which the pastor had treated in the sermon. With the mother, children, and the slaves gathered about the table, the father should "rehearse" the sermon. The other members of the group should ask questions on points not understood, and all should apply what had been said to their immediate situations. The slaves, too, should be allowed to point out how members of the family had been guilty of the sins against which the preacher had warned.⁴⁵

At times the father should review only a part of the sermon and allow his wife or one of the children to finish it. This encouraged them to remember what had been said. Questions directed by the parents to the children and the slaves, John declared, would add to the learning situation.⁴⁶

Such discussions could continue the rest of the day and be supplemented by group singing.⁴⁷ In the event that the father had to return to his business he should at least discuss the sermon with the family.⁴⁸

Home devotions conducted in this manner would make the public worship more meaningful, prepare the family for the next service, and give the minister confidence that he was actually accomplishing something.⁴⁹ A day spent in religious discussions would bring pleasant dreams to all.⁵⁰

John further urged that before attending the public service,

the family should read that section of the Bible which was to be treated in the sermon in order to prepare their understanding and facilitate the task of the preacher.⁵¹

As may be imagined, not everyone accepted John's advice. Parents believed that children would not understand their discussions. Once John answered this criticism:

Let no one tell me that our children ought not to be occupied with these things; they ought not only to be occupied with them, but to be zealous about them only.⁵²

Particularly the fathers felt that it was expecting too much of them and was a waste of time to have such extensive devotional periods. They were quickly reminded that they did not consider it a waste of time to discuss the races or to take the children to the theater. School lessons were usually discussed. In fact, parents seemed to find leisure for everything else except God's Word.⁵³

On days when there were no public services, part of the meal should be devoted to Bible stories skillfully told by the father and followed by a question period. John emphasized that the meaning must be clarified by drawing parallels to the times and be strengthened with an application to their immediate life.

The mothers were urged to join in by telling parts of the story or by praising the children when they answered correctly. After the story had been told on successive occasions, the children should relate the stories themselves. After they knew them, they would be happy when they recognized them as they were read during the church service.⁵⁴

The education of the child must begin with infancy, for then the mind could best be impressed with good principles which could not readily be effaced.⁵⁵ The little child needed to hear wholesome conversations,

for from its tenderness it readily stores up what is said; and what children hear is impressed as a seal on the wax of their minds. Besides, it is then that their life begins to incline to vice or virtue; and if from the very gates and portals one lead them away from iniquity and guide them by the hand to the best road, he will fix them for the time to come in a sort of habit and nature, and they will not, even if they be willing, easily change for the worse, since this force of custom draws them to the performance of good actions.⁵⁶

Even the name of the young child was considered by John to be an important influence in his life. He deplored the custom of naming children after their relatives or friends. It was still worse when they practiced the heathen custom of lighting candles and giving each one a name, and then naming the child after the candle which burned longest. Instead, children should be named after Biblical characters, the martyrs, or the bishops. The name of righteous persons would encourage the children to pattern their lives after them, and so the saints would continue to live and come into the homes of Christians.⁵⁷

The father should be a companion to his boy and spend some time taking walks with him or sitting down for a little talk on some serious topic, "drawing him away from all childish folly." "For," John tells the father, "thou art raising a philosopher and athlete and citizen of heaven."⁵⁸

John's idea of home training may be summed up in his own words to the father who should take his cue from the painter or the sculptor when considering his role as educator:

Like the creators of statues, do you give all your leisure to fashioning these wondrous statues for God? And, as you remove what is superfluous and add what is lacking, inspect them day by day, to see what good qualities nature has supplied so that you will increase them, and what faults so that you will eradicate them? And, first of all, take the greatest care to banish licentious speech; for love of this above all frets the souls of the young. Before he is of an age to try it, teach thy son to be sober and vigilant and to shorten sleep for the sake of prayer, and with every word and deed to set upon himself the seal of the faith.⁵⁹

John conceived the home also as a place for the training of adults, for education was a continuous process. Here again the father had the chief responsibility. He must continue to teach his wife in attaining a more noble life and to share with her the benefits of the church service.⁶⁰ However, much of this was to be a mutual teaching, for the wife should also help the husband to improve his habits when this was necessary.⁶¹

While John did not believe that a woman should teach in public, she did have this opportunity in her home.⁶² In such cases where the husband was pious and showed the same in his life, it was not even proper for the wife to teach him at home.⁶³ This did not

mean, however, that she could not teach a husband when he was remiss in his habits or when he was a heathen. In such cases, because the husband was not living up to his responsibility as the head, it was the woman's task to teach the ways of Christianity.⁶⁴

The instruction of the adults in the home included the slaves. "Teach them to be religious," John advised.⁶⁵ Since the slaves had no other opportunity except that given by their masters, the husband and the wife must see to it that this responsibility of ownership was conscientiously carried out.⁶⁶

John had no delusions about the strength of the Christian home of his day. He was aware that it was decadent because of encroaching Hellenism, fatalism, and immorality, yet he did not suggest that the Church or the State should set about establishing a new type of school. Because he conceived the home's influence as potentially the most important environment for good, he employed every device he could think of to place the home on a firmer footing. Using the pulpit as a platform for adult education, he instructed parents in the training of their children. By means of sound instruction, the inculcation of good habits, the erection of acceptable standards and a consistent life of Christian philosophy, children should receive the major portion of their education under the direction of their parents. In the home every phase of education could normally be rooted with success. John's views on the importance of the home as an educational agency and his stress on domestic training were among his finest contributions to education.

REFERENCES

1. Frederick Eby and Charles Flinn Arrowood, *The History and Philosophy of Education, Ancient and Medieval* (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1942), pp. 603 ff.
2. Franciscus Schulte, *S. Joannis Chrysostomi de Inani Gloria et de Educandis Liberis*, Progr. Gaesdonck. No. 627 (Guestfolorum Monasterii: Schoeningh, 1914), II. This edition of John's treatise will hereafter be referred to as *Schulte*. The translation from this treatise is that of M. L. W. Laistner in *Christianity and Pagan Culture in the Later Roman Empire* (Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1951), pp. 85—122, and quoted with the express permission of the publisher.
3. Another important treatise of John dealing with education is: "S. Joannes Chrysostomus," *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca Prior*, edited by J. P. Migne (Paris: 1863), "Against the Opponents of Monasticism," XXXXVII. It is the only writing which also discusses the school. Sermons dealing with the education of children are, in the main, digressions from another topic. John took every occasion to emphasize Christian training

in the home. These sermons include: "Matthew, Homilies V, XI, XXXXIX, LIX, LXXXI," LVI and LVII; "Ephesians, Homily XXI," LXII; "John, Homilies III and XXV," LIX; "2 Corinthians, Homily XV," LXI; "Sermon on Anna, I and III," LIV; "1 Timothy, Homily IX," LXII; "Sermon on the Selection of Widows," LI. Hereafter Migne's edition will be referred to as MPG.

4. MPG, "1 Timothy, Homily IX," LXII, 546.
5. MPG, "Sermon on Anna, I," LIV, 634 ff. "On the Seven Maccabean Brothers and Their Mother, I," L, 621.
6. MPG, "On the Selection of Widows," LI, 327. "Genesis, Homily LIX," LIV, 519.
7. MPG, "1 Timothy, Homily IX," LXII, 546 f.
8. MPG, "Matthew, Homily XXXXIX," LVIII, 504.
9. MPG, "Matthew, Homily XI," LVII, 201.
10. MPG, "Sermon on Anna, I," LIV, 642.
11. MPG, "Against the Opponents of Monasticism, III," XXXXVII, 355.
12. MPG, "Ephesians, Homily XXI," LXII, 151. "Sermon on Anna, III," LIV, 653. "Matthew, Homily LIX," LVIII, 583. "Sermon on the Selection of Widows," LI, 327.
13. MPG, "Sermon on Anna, I," LIV, 637 f.
14. C. Schmidt, *The Social Results of Early Christianity*, translated by Mary Thorpe (London: Wm. Isbister, Ltd., 1889), p. 207.
15. *Schulte*, II, 37.
16. MPG, "Matthew, Homily LIX," LVIII, 584.
17. MPG, "Sermon on the Selection of Widows," LI, 328.
18. *Schulte*, II, 23. MPG, "1 Corinthians, Homily XXXIV," LXI, 290. "Ephesians, Homily XX," LXII, 141.
19. MPG, "Sermon on Anna, I," LIV, 637. "Ephesians, Homily XXI," LXII, 149 f.
20. MPG, "Genesis, Homily IV," LIV, 597.
21. *Schulte*, II, 26.
22. *Ibid.*, 67.
23. MPG, "Matthew, Homily XXXI," LVII, 519.
24. *Schulte*, II, 30.
25. MPG, "Ephesians, Homily XX," LXII, 150.
26. MPG, "Sermon on the Selection of Widows," LI, 328.
27. MPG, "Against the Opponents of Monasticism, III," XXXXVII, 355.
28. MPG, "Sermon on the Selection of Widows," LI, 327.
29. MPG, "1 Timothy, Homily IX," LXII, 548.
30. *Schulte*, II, 90. MPG, "On the Priesthood, III," XXXXVIII, 657.
31. MPG, "1 Timothy, Homily IX," LXII, 547.
32. MPG, "Sermon on the Words 'Avoid Fornication,'" LI, 211.
33. MPG, "Sermon in Praise of Maximus," LI, 236.
34. MPG, "On the Priesthood, III," XXXXVIII, 657.
35. MPG, "1 Timothy, Homily IX," LXII, 547. "Sermon on Anna, III," LIV, 659.
36. MPG, "On the Priesthood, III," XXXXVIII, 657.
37. MPG, "Colossians, Homily X," LXX, 374.

38. MPG, "Sermon on the Selection of Widows," 327.
39. MPG, "Genesis, Homily XXXII," LIII, 299 f. "Colossians, Homily X," LXX, 374. "Sermon on Anna, IV," LIV, 661. *Schulte*, II, 77.
40. MPG, "Sermon on the Selection of Widows," LI, 330.
41. MPG, "Matthew, Homily X," LVII, 191.
42. *Schulte*, II, 37. 68.
43. *Ibid.*, 31. 71. MPG, "Sermon on the Selection of Widows," LI, 327.
44. MPG, "Sermon on Anna, II," LIV, 650.
45. MPG, "Genesis, Homily II," LIII, 31, and "Homily VI," LIV, 607. "Sermon on the Statues, VI," XXXXIX, 90. "Matthew, Homily V," LVII, 55. "Introduction to Acts, Sermon III," LI, 90. "Sermon on the Parable of the Ten Thousand Talents," LI, 19. "Ephesians, Homily XX," LXII, 147.
46. MPG, "John, Homily III," LIX, 37.
47. MPG, "Psalms, Homily XXXXI," LV, 157.
48. MPG, "Matthew, Homily V," LVII, 55.
49. MPG, "Genesis, Homily II," LIII, 31.
50. MPG, "Genesis, Homily VI," LIV, 607.
51. MPG, "Matthew, Homily I," LVII, 20 f.
52. MPG, "John, Homily III," LIX, 37.
53. *Ibid.*
54. *Schulte*, II, 39—52.
55. *Ibid.*, 19. MPG, "Sermon on Anna, III," LIV, 658.
56. MPG, "John, Homily III," LIX, 37.
57. *Schulte*, II, 47—50.
58. *Ibid.*, 39. 59.
59. *Ibid.*, 22.
60. MPG, "Introduction to Acts, Sermon IV," LI, 99. "Ephesians, Homily XX," LXII, 145 f. "Sermon on the Selection of Widows," LI, 329.
61. MPG, "Homily on the Statues, V," XXXXIX, 80.
62. MPG, "Titus, Homily IV," LXII, 683.
63. MPG, "Sermon on the Words 'Greet Priscilla and Aquila,' I," LI, 192.
64. MPG, "Romans, Homily XXXI," LX, 669. "Genesis, Homily V," LIV, 599 f.
65. MPG, "Ephesians, Homily XXII," LXII, 158.
66. MPG, "Titus, Homily IV," LXII, 685. "Ephesians, Homily XV," LXII, 110.

St. Louis, Mo.

Liturgical Developments in Europe

By WALTER E. BUSZIN

DESPITE the many serious impediments imposed by destructive warfare and total defeat, the Germans have published perhaps more liturgical literature during the past few post-war years than the people of any other nation. This is significant already because it indicates clearly that they do not regard liturgics as an area which is rather nonessential in character. The ravages and dispossessions of war and defeat drive man to the stark realities and basic needs of life and existence. In days of scarcity and want, man craves not dessert and luxury; on the contrary, he is then perfectly satisfied and altogether happy with substantial food and the simple, ordinary comforts of life. The Germans are convinced that liturgical worship practices belong to the vital necessities of the Christian life. At any rate, amid all their wants and discomforts of life they are not tempted to resort to revivalistic and theatrical worship practices in order to seek and receive the strength and sustenance they need from above.

Germany's largest and most widely known liturgical group is the *Evangelische Michaelsbruderschaft*. This organization, however, is an offspring of the former *Berneuchener* group, which was organized in 1923 and whose members were active in the youth movement (*Jugendbewegung*) which played such an important part in the religious renaissance of Germany about thirty years ago. The *Berneuchener* were sacramentalists; their zeal was in no small measure a reaction against the religious indifference of their day. They published much liturgical literature, and among their leaders we find men like Rudolf Spieker, Ludwig Heitmann, Wilhelm Staehlin, and Karl Bernhard Ritter. The *Berneuchener*, however, never sought to function as a well-organized body. When eventual developments brought to light that they would be able to function with better results if better organized, they, in 1931, changed their name and called the organization *Die Evangelische Michaelsbruderschaft*. While the name *Berneuchener* was derived from the baronial estate *Berneuchen* near Neudamm in Neumark, where from

1923 to 1927 the group met annually for a week, the name *Michaelsbruderschaft* was derived from the name of the archangel who battles for God against the powers of darkness. The objectives of the *Michaelsbruderschaft* are set forth in the words:

"Die Evangelische Michaelsbruderschaft ist erwachsen aus der gemeinsamen erfahrenen Not der Kirche; sie ist begründet in dem Glauben an die der Kirche Jesu Christi gegebene Verheissung; sie ist gewillt, ihre Glieder zu rechten Streitern im Kampf der Kirche zu erziehen und zusammenzuschliessen." Cf. Ernst Jansen, *Die Evangelische Michaelsbruderschaft*. Kassel, 1949, p. 7.

Much excellent literature has been written by members of the *Michaelsbruderschaft*, chiefly in pamphlet form and published by the Johannes Stauda-Verlag in Kassel. Sacramentalism still plays a most important part in the thinking and activities of its members; however, the sermon is not neglected. In the Foreword of his *Vom Wagnis der Predigt* (Stuttgart, 1950), Wilhelm Staehlin expresses the hope that the publication of this booklet of 63 pages will help to disprove the legendary claims of his adversaries, who insist that his liturgical interests have made him indifferent towards the delivery of sermons in the liturgical service of worship.

One finds among many members of the *Michaelsbruderschaft* a healthy respect for Christian doctrine, a live interest in the arts and in music, an insistence on working in the world and among people as a leaven, a live interest in Christian education, a profound and active concern for the welfare of the souls of men, an awareness of the very real and serious shortcomings of a State church, an interest in the development of German free churches, and a profound recognition of the ecumenical character of the Church.

From September 4 to 8 the *Evangelische Michaelsbruderschaft* convened at the university in Marburg to observe its twentieth anniversary, to worship, to grow and profit by the discussion of vital problems, and to enjoy Christian fellowship. No fewer than 350 members attended the conference. Guests were present from Holland, France, England, Denmark, and the United States. The consecration and devotion of the group were indeed remarkable. One noted that no loitering was done during the sessions; there was no "cutting" of the numerous daily devotional exercises; one observed no dozing and inattentiveness during the reading of various

dissertations; there was no propagandizing and electioneering between sessions, no gossiping, likewise no general exodus before the conference had reached its close. Much time was devoted, not to the discussion of problems of a liturgical character, but rather to the problems of Christian stewardship (*Diakonie*); however, stewardship was discussed not in its relationship to money matters and financial problems, but rather from the standpoint of Christian service. It was emphasized that Christians should honor and esteem for their work's sake not only the members of the Christian clergy, but likewise all others who devote their lives to Christian service, e. g., teachers, deaconesses, church musicians, lay workers of various kinds, custodians and janitors, etc. Taking the term in its original and best sense, all such full-time servants of the Church constitute the ecclesiastical hierarchy of Christendom. Weight was added to these thoughts by the fact that they were spoken by a Lutheran bishop, D. Dr. Wilhelm Staehlin of Oldenburg, the title of whose dissertation was "*Hierarchie, von der Ordnung der Aemter und dem Dienst in der Kirche*." Other papers read were based on the topics *Christus und die Welt*, by Prof. D. Heinz-Dietrich Wendland of Kiel; *Die Liturgie als die Gestalt des Gebets der Kirche*, by Kirchenrat Dr. Karl Bernhard Ritter of Marburg, and *Der Mensch zwischen Himmel und Erde*, by Prof. D. Adolf Koeberle, professor of systematic theology at the University of Tuebingen.

The spirit and practice of Christian fellowship were evident throughout the conference, though no paper related to this particular topic was read. Visitors were not given the opportunity to feel strange; while one did feel isolated by not partaking of the Lord's Supper with the *Bruderschaft*, it did not take long to discover that none other than the eminent liturgical scholar Prof. D. Friedrich Heiler occupied the same pew in the balcony with the writer and likewise did not partake of the Sacrament. Since the Eucharist, like the Lord's Prayer, is intended only for those who are members of the household of the Christian faith, it is indeed not surprising to note that an organization like the *Michaelsbruderschaft* seeks to foster the spirit and practice of Christian *koinoonia*. All members of the *Bruderschaft* addressed one another with the German familiar forms of address, regardless of what their calling, profession, or station might be; one found among them not only

bishops and pastors, but likewise physicians, lawyers, judges, men of high political rank, artists, authors, and common laborers. The doctrine of the universal priesthood was referred to repeatedly and related to the fellowship of Christian people.

The sermons and chapel addresses were Christ-centered and thus were quite different from sermons one must still hear in Lutheran churches of Germany. The liturgies used were elaborate, but by no means theatrical or pompous. A confessional service conducted in the chapel of the University on the evening of September 4 lasted an hour and a half and proved to be very solemn and impressive. The music was churchly and very well done; Gregorian chant and the Lutheran chorale were used almost exclusively, though a polyphonic setting of the Kyrie sung by a small choir proved to be refreshing, particularly from the musical point of view. All services of worship were very well integrated, and no one part suffered because of overemphasis of another. One does hear expressions from members of the *Michaelsbruderschaft* which many others who hold membership in the Lutheran Church will not readily subscribe to, e. g.: that the Apostolic Succession is needed in the Lutheran Church of Germany and other countries, as they have it in Norway and Sweden; that Lutherans should build cloisters and monasteries in which men may work and produce for the Church without being disturbed by family ties and other hindrances; that polyphonic music is baneful and foreign to the ideal service of worship; that theological differences are not to play too strong a role in determining whether one is to be admitted to the Lord's Table; finally, that Luther possessed very little genuine liturgical acumen and hence helped to introduce the spirit of sectarianism into the Lutheran Church. Such claims are made, of course, also by many who are not members of the *Evangelische Michaelsbruderschaft*. Such claims explain why some do not wish to be identified with any kind of liturgical movement, since it is believed quite generally that liturgical groups and movements too often do not know where to draw the line and come to a halt. While one hears similar reactions also in Europe, one notes, however, that the rich literature written by members of the *Michaelsbruderschaft* is used diligently and even with enthusiasm also by many who refuse to hold membership in this body.

A small, select group of those who had been present at Marburg journeyed to Assenheim after the Marburg sessions to discuss there, on September 8 and 9, certain problems of ecumenicity as well as of liturgical development in other lands. This *Oekumenische Tagung* was arranged largely for those who had been honored guests at the *Tagungen* in Marburg. While several guests, including the writer, were unable to attend, others, according to the official record, submitted rather thought-provoking and interesting reports. The Rev. B. von Schenk submitted a comprehensive report regarding the liturgical and educational practices of his parish, Our Savior's Ev. Lutheran Church of New York. He likewise discussed present-day liturgical tendencies among Presbyterians and Methodists, as well as among certain Lutheran church bodies in America. Pastor Wiebe Vos of Holland, secretary of the Commission on Faith and Order (Ways of Worship) and a graduate of Oxford University, where he had been a pupil of the liturgiologist William D. Maxwell, gave an historical account of liturgical developments in Holland. He showed how the ecumenical interests of Holland have helped to dampen and modify much of its Reformed antiliturgical spirit and activities and pointed particularly to the effective work done by his former mentor, Prof. Van der Leeuw. Today also the leading spirits of the Reformed Church in Holland are grappling with the problems of liturgics, new literature is being written, and a Council for the Solution of Problems of Worship has been formed which has helped to prepare the *Ontwerp Dienstboek voor de Nederlandse Hervormde Kerk*. In this book not only various Calvinistic orders of service may be found, but likewise a Lutheran-Catholic mass which includes the *Anamnesis* and the *Epiklesis*. A 64-page liturgical periodical is today published and read in Holland; its editor is the successor to Prof. Van der Leeuw, Prof. J. N. Bakhuizen van den Brink. Though warned that liturgical worship would drive people out of his church, Pastor Vos stated that his experience has been the contrary and that his church attendance has grown steadily and considerably.

An interesting report was submitted by the two guests present from Copenhagen, Denmark, namely, Pastors Borregaard and Lissner. While they were happy to state that in Denmark the old traditional vestments and paraments are still used, they regretted

to state that, unlike Norway and Sweden, Denmark had lost the Apostolic Succession already in 1537 and had never regained it. Church attendance is very poor among the Danes. Two sacramental movements have taken place in Denmark within the last century: The first was the work of the *Grundvigianer*, who are so sacramental that they reject at least part of the Bible as a "pope"; the second was instigated by an inner mission group which has strong pietistic leanings, which, true to the policies and practices of Pietism, conducts services of worship in private homes and small assembly halls, but which sends its members to the clergy and to the church when they wish to receive Holy Communion. The *Grundvigianer* are unliturgical. Among the Danish Barthians, as well as among other groups of Denmark, there exists a strong aversion to Holy Communion, some going so far as to say: "The way to the Lord's Supper is the way to hell." Pastor Borregaard reported also concerning the activities of the Danish liturgical Fraternity of St. Ansgar, which has a membership of fifteen theologians and twenty laymen, and Pastor Lissner spoke of his *Theologisches Oratorium*, which has a membership of eighty clergymen and a few students of the two universities of Denmark.

Before final adjournment took place, some thought was given to the suggestion that a Eucharistic Congress take place in Germany next year which is to be modeled after those conducted by the Roman Catholic Church in the United States of America.

St. Louis, Mo.

HOMILETICS

A ROYAL PRIEST — IN MY WORLD OUTLOOK

The Theme for January. — The Epiphany cycle is fruitful in materials for this theme. Is. 60:1-6 sounds the note of God's mercy for the Gentiles, and the Bethlehem star reminds that Christ was born for them too. As pointed out below, a number of lessons of the month underscore the concept also that Christians who have Christ's life in them are to be an epiphany of Christ to the world. In that accent lies the relation of the royal priesthood to the Epiphany.

Sermon Study on Romans 12:16-21 for the Third Sunday After Epiphany

The Third Sunday after Epiphany. The manifestation of Christ to the world. The *Gospel*: Christ's miracle of healing manifests Him as the Son of God. *Introit*: Believers rejoice in God; let all the earth join in. *Gradual*: The heathen shall fear the name of the Lord. *Collect*: God's manifestation to be one of powerful defense. *This text*: The manifestation most easily seen by the world, Christians as "living epistles" reflecting in attitude and conduct the very nature of Christ.

Context. Appropriately the Standard Epistle texts for the first three Sundays after Epiphany come from Romans 12. The theme appears in v. 1, which with its "therefore" relates this chapter to all that precedes, namely, the record of the divine imputation of the "mercies of God." This supplies motivation for the appeal: "Present your bodies a living sacrifice . . . unto God," the bodies as instruments for God's use in revealing the divine nature to the world. Hence, "be not conformed to this world"; it supplies only the setting for Christian action. "Be transformed," God-wise. Let this appear in your relations with one another as Christians; now (text), with all men, "the world," even your enemies.

The Priesthood. Sacrificing was formerly the work of the priest class; here all Christians are appealed to for a sacrifice. The object is to be our own bodies. Yes, as completely as the "slaughter-sacri-

fice" (Lenski) was offered, so wholeheartedly do we bring our sacrifice of ourselves. Yet, it is to be a "*living* sacrifice"; just as Christ wholly offered Himself and now lives for us, so our offering is fulfilled in our continued living unto God. The priesthood of *all* believers! This is applicable to all who have been redeemed by the "mercies of God."

V. 16c. This verse might well be omitted as fitting better with the preceding. Christians are "wise unto salvation," but not "wise in their own conceits," literally, alongside themselves (*παρά*), in their own estimation. This will violate "one-mindedness" (v. 16a) and engender strife. The intrusion of an imperative (*γίνεσθε*) in the midst of infinitives and participles, all strung together without so much as an *ἔστε*, has the force of "Don't be that way"; present tense: "Do not have the habit of becoming" (Robertson). Self-conceit is unthinkable for the royal priest who has offered his whole self to God.

V. 17. The worldly attitude divides acquaintances into friend and foe, and dispenses kindness or hatred accordingly. The royal priest is to "recompense to no man evil for evil"; "to no man" regardless of who he is, though an unbeliever, a Gentile, an "enemy," an outsider. Never "evil for evil," *κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ*, no tit for tat, no repaying of meanness with more meanness (*κακόν*, bad, base, mean), no "he hit me first, therefore I must hit him back," the ingrained carnal attitude so very prevalent in the world. The motto of Scotland: *Nemo me impune lacessit*. "The world calls it manhood; it is doghood rather!" (John Trapp, quoted in Newell's commentary.)

We are not to "recompense" (*ἀποδίδωμι*) pay off, pay back, literally, to put away a thing by giving or paying; does the vengeful man hope to rid himself of the mean thing by returning it? Experience shows it makes matters only worse. The royal priest is to be like his Lord, who, though "reviled, reviled not again," 1 Peter 2:23, 21.

No evil is the believer to do, but things "honest" (*καλά*), better, "lovely, pleasing, noble, praiseworthy." Note the change to the plural: not one mean thing is he to do, but noble things a-plenty. These he is to "provide," to think of beforehand (*προνοέω*, middle with the accusative of the thing thought, planned for). Noble

deeds are to appear not by accident, but as the product of deliberate planning. After all, the priest's "living sacrifice" of himself has been a "reasonable service," full of thought and spirit.

This is done for God's sake to be "acceptable" (v. 1) to Him, but the Christian is conscious of being observed. Regardless of who looks ("in the sight of all men"), things noble are to appear. Compare parallels, 1 Thess. 5:15; 2 Cor. 8:21. This is our Christian calling, 1 Peter 3:9-18; Matt. 5:16.

V. 18. Keep the punctuation of the A. V.: "If possible" — first, the *objective* possibility. Implication: It may not always be possible, in view of circumstances. The confessing of God's name, loyalty to Savior, Church, truth, faith, duty, may require boldness and may lead to "not peace, but a sword," Matt. 10:34. We're still in the Church Militant.

However, as regards ourselves, the *subjective* possibility, let not the peace be disturbed. "As much as lieth in you," τό, the accusative of general reference, literally, "the from-you part" (Robertson), or as for what arises (ἐξ) out of you. Strife is not to originate with the believer.

Rather he will "live peaceably with all men," 2 Cor. 13:11; Mark 9:50; 1 Thess. 5:13. Εἰρηνεύω, to make peace, then to cultivate, maintain, be at, live in peace. How often Paul practiced this "if possible" and "as much as lieth in you"! Grotius: *Omnium amici este, si fieri potest; si non potest utrimque, certe ex vestra parte amici este*. On the other hand, *Neque enim fieri potest, ut Christi militibus aeterna sit pax cum mundo, cuius princeps est Satan* (Calvin, quoted in Philippi).

V. 19. In order to strengthen his appeal in this difficult matter, the Apostle inserts the address "Dearly beloved," ἀγαπητοί. Jesus was the Beloved One, ὁ Ἀγαπητός, Matt. 3:17, etc. Christians generally are the ἀγαπητοὶ Θεοῦ, Rom. 1:7, etc. But they are that in a community sense, all of them together. Paul loves his readers with a divinely wrought love; perhaps he intends to remind them that they are "fellow beloved, sc. of God."

"Avenge not yourselves"; note the change to finite verbs with the stepped-up action. The stress is on the *yourselves*. Do not take the law into your own hands (even in civil law, no judge may sit on his own case). Ἐκδικέω, to vindicate one's own right, to do

justice (what the poor widow wanted the judge to do for her, Luke 18:3); δική, justice, penalty, ἐκ, exacted *from* a person.

This is the prerogative of a higher Judge. "Give place unto wrath, *sc.* of God." Τόπον is indefinite, "a portion of space viewed in reference to its occupancy" (Thayer), implying "time and opportunity to work" (Meyer), like our "elbow room," "make way for the doctor!" (cp. Eph. 4:27: "place to the devil"). Let God occupy the place of dispensing justice, not you; you step aside, get out of the way. You are only a priest of God, not God Himself!

Other suggestions as to the subject of the ὀργή must be rejected, such as "stand aside for the wrath of the offender, that is, let his anger burn itself out," though this might seem to fit the sense of Matt. 5:39; nor, "give place to your own wrath, that is, let it exhaust its resentment before taking any action," though this usage could be defended by Latin parallels. Rather, the reference must be to God's wrath because of contrast with the preceding "avenge not *yourselves*" and because of the following quotation, which points to God. Nor is it unworthy of God to have anger toward the "enemy," this emotion "in which God is as opposed to man's wickedness." Paul's readers know all about this (article, *the*, that well-known, wrath of God), from a full description in chap. 2.

The quotation is from Deut. 32:35 (also quoted Heb. 10:30 f.).

"Vengeance" has the same root as before; is also used of government in Rom. 13:4. "I will repay," same root as v. 17a, with prefix ἀντί; God stands over against the evildoer and pays him off, accurately, personally. Ἐμοί, to Me it belongs, it is My business, and Mine alone. How presumptuous of man to push God off the judgment seat and to take over His duties! How unthinkable for a royal priest who knows his place under the rule of God!

Nor does the believer gloat over the prospect of doom overtaking his enemy (compare the following). When standing back and giving God room, "it is not thus implied that the falling of Divine vengeance on our enemy should be our desire and purpose, but only this, that, if punishment is due, we must leave it to the righteous God to inflict it; it is not for *us* to do so." (*Pulpit Commentary.*)

V. 20. "Therefore" — if we are not to avenge ourselves, what then? Remain passive and idle? No, good may be done. Not vengeance, but its very opposite.

Follows now a direct quotation from Prov. 25:21 f., quoted by the Apostle without quotation marks. "Enemy," the adjective used as substantive, here with the addition of a genitive pronoun, may mean either "hated" or "hating." In view of the context, it is best taken as objective, one who is hostile toward you.

"If he hunger, feed him"; if he suffer want, here in its proper sense of "be hungry"; "feed him," literally, feed by putting a bit or crumb into his mouth, as one might feed a small child or a convalescent. We might almost translate: if he hungers, *tenderly* feed him. "If he thirst, give him drink," hold a cup to his mouth (a glass straw to his lips). Both samples, and that is what these are, indicate an absence of all bitterness, yes, even of mere indifference on the part of the believer. Indeed, his love is to be shown not *in absentia*, the help is not merely to be thrown in the "enemy's" direction; in every way the Christian acts as friend.

"For in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head." Rule out promptly any suggestion of injuring the enemy (Hengstenberg: Do deeds of kindness, and so aggravate his case before God so he will all the more merit God's wrath!), else how could a Christian wholeheartedly proceed to "heap up" deeds of kindness? And how would that overcome evil (v. 21)?

Stoeckhardt quotes Hofmann: Coals of fire have to be noticed. Better, they cause discomfort, even pain, the sense of shame, a compunction about the shabby treatment shown the believer. The end result of not merely casual sparks of kindness, but "coals of fire," live, burning, heaped up, may well be penitence on his part, reconciliation with you, peace. How well such activity harmonizes with the priest's role in the world!

True, many will dismiss this as "impossible." And, apart from "the mercies of God" it is! Yet priests of God, having offered themselves wholly to God, are not carrying chips on their shoulders (v. 16c), have taken forethought to do always things noble (v. 17b), strive continually to keep peace (v. 18). They follow the great High Priest, who prayed for His enemies, yea, died for them, etc.

V. 21. Summary: "Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good." The verb is *νικάω*, to conquer, to carry off the victory. Well, this is what the vengeful person seeks for himself. How much better the method and the result for the royal priest! The

hater is consumed by his own hatred; evil overcomes the evildoer. If a Christian yields to the spirit of vengeance, he has been defeated, perhaps a mortal blow has been inflicted on him as a Christian and priest of God!

No, in the Christian's hand is the powerful weapon of "good," not καλά, as before, but ἀγαθόν, admirable in the sense of useful, salutary, beneficial. This leads to triumph of the highest order. It may lead to reconciliation, perhaps even to repentance and faith, as the "enemy" comes *with us* to "glorify your Father which is in heaven" — yes, so that even the angels may celebrate the victory.

This is the Christian's life program and calling (present imperatives, continuing action). Not to be overcome, to let evil get us down (ὑπό, be overcome *under* evil), but rise above it. So the chapter ends triumphantly: Subdue your enemy with kindness!

SUGGESTED OUTLINES

Life is full of irritations and injuries, also for the priest of God; some people are actually hostile. What of the priest of God in such a setting? God says:

This means *"Love — Even the Enemy"*

- I. Leave the dispensing of justice in the hands of God
- II. Act as a channel of mercy in the stead of God

Or: *The Priest of God in a Hostile World*

- I. Let God be God — I *am* His priest
 - A. Not wise in my own conceits, in relation to God and man, v. 16c;
 - B. No "evil for evil," or "vengeance," vv. 17a, 19;
 - C. My purpose in life: "things honest," "live peaceably," vv. 17b, 18;
 - D. My failure to keep my place emphasizes my need for God.
- II. Let my light shine — I *am* His priest
 - A. His mercy fills my need ("mercies," v. 1; "beloved," v. 19); Review Phil. 2:5-8; Rom. 5:5-10; Luke 23:34; etc.;
 - B. Now I love (1 John 4:19) even my enemy, v. 20;
 - C. And so fulfill my priesthood, vv. 20b, 21; Matt. 5:16; 1 Peter 2:9.

Honolulu, Hawaii

WINFRED A. SCHROEDER

10-4602

ICS

ber.
red,
ian

d,"
ful,
ler.
ith,
in
ry.
m-
get
the

od;
ch

nd

y,"

od.

));

6;